A DEFENCE OF THE DISCOURSE Concerning the EARTH Before the FLOOD.

BEING

A full Reply to a late ANSWER to Exceptions made against the

Theory of the Earth:

Wherein those Exceptions are Vindicated and Reinforced: And Objections against the New Hypothesis of the DELUGE, Answered.

Exceptions also are made against the Review of the Theory.

By *ERASMUS WARREN*, Rector of *Worlington*, in *Suffolk*.

---

2 Timoth. iii, viii, ix.

Ἀντέστησαν Μωυσεῖ,—ἀλλ' οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον.

LONDON:
Printed for *John Southby*, at the *Harrow* in *Cornhil*. 1691.

210
Xref.222.11
cards
690

Licenſed,

Feb. 11. Rob. Midgley.

A DEFENCE OF THE DISCOURSE Concerning the EARTH Before the Flood.

The Introduction.

WHen in my *Exceptions* I diſcourſed ſo largely againſt the *Theory of the Earth*, I did not intend to ingage with it again; nor ſhould I have done it but for very good Reaſons; the principal of which are theſe four.

Firſt, To vindicate GOD's Veracity. To the doing of which, by ſpeaking, or writing, upon juſt and neceſſary occaſions or accounts; I Take my very *having*

of a Tongue and Hand, to be ſufficient Obligations. And truly, what is more fit, and what *can* be more needful, than to vindicate this Attribute (one of the chief of GOD's מידות, or Divine Properties) and aſſert the Perfection and Inviolableneſs of it? For upon it depends no leſs than our future Welfare, or everlaſting Happineſs. Take away this Veracity, and the Goſpel (according to Pope *Leo* the Tenths expreſſion) is but *Fabula Chriſti*, a piece of meer Forgery. And ſhould Scripture be Fabulous, where's our ſecurity for a better Life? Then our Faith is vain, and our Hope without foundation, and we can lay no claim to the high Felicities of the Eternal World. And yet, if *all* that the Great GOD has ſaid, be not firm and true, in every punctilio or *tittle* of it, this Veracity of His is not Inviolable; and ſo, what have Mankind left them to truſt to? For ſhould GOD deceive them in *one* caſe, he might do it in *more*; and if he does it in *many*, he may do it in *all*: and then, what ſhall ſupport them as to their nobleſt Intereſts? The firſt reaſon, therefore, of this ſecond ſally of my Pen here, is farther to defend the *truth* of GOD, and to reſcue ſome Texts of the Holy Bible from ſuch imputations of falſhood, as the Doctrine of the Theory involves them in. And indeed, if ſuch imputations could be juſtly faſtned upon any *part* of the inſpired Volume, they would bid fair towards cancelling the *whole*. Do we not plainly ſee, that if one ſingle link breaks or drops off, the continuity of the Chain is quite diſſolved? So if the leaſt ſingle paſſage of GOD's Word be falſe, it certainly ſhews the reſt to be fallible; and a failure of truth in any *one* of its periods, overthrows the credibility of *all* the other. And then, in ſhort, we have neither proofs, nor hopes, nor any manner of aſſurance of bleſſed Immortality; that unſpeakably excellent and glorious thing, to which we

we all *do*, or *ſhould* aſpire. Our title to *that* is for ever blaſted, becauſe then the authentick Charter which contains it, proves counterfeit Evidence, and a ſpecious Nullity.

Secondly, To maintain the honour of *Moſes*. Who, if he had not been dignify'd with the high Privilege of Divine Inſpiration, ought upon his *own* account, to have been *above* all ſuſpicion of fiction or falſhood. And to charge him with either, tho but indirectly, and even in his naked Perſonal capacity, muſt ſeem too inſufferable a diminution or diſparagement of his Greatneſs and Worthineſs. For according to *Philo*, as in his Offices he was *high*; being * *by the Providence of GOD, both a King, and a Lawgiver, and a Prophet, and an High Prieſt, and incomparable in every one* of the Functions: And as in his Affections he was *holy*, being † *a moſt pure Mind*, and ‖ *the greateſt Saint, and Lover of GOD that ever lived*: So in his Writings he was *True*; as § *not taking up with things probable, or credible, but following after ſincere*, or exacteſt *verity*. Yet this moſt excellent and admirable Author, as he was ſufficiently *diſregarded* by the Theoriſt before; ſo by his defending his *Anti-Moſaic* aſſertions, he is little leſs than deſpiſed now. For by making ſome Paſſages in his famous *Coſmopœia*, untrue; he degrades it into the rank of meer fabulous or conjectural Writings.

* Ἐγένετο προνοίᾳ Θεοῦ βασιλεύς τε καὶ νομοθέτης, καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ προφήτης, καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τα προσήκοντα ἀνέσχετο. De Vit. Moſ. lib. 2.

† Μωσῆς μὲν ὅτι νοῦς ὁ καθαρώτατος. Id. de Nomin. Mutatione.

‖ Μωϋσῆν ὁσιώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον ἅμα πότε γενομένων. Id. de vita Moſ. lib. 3.

§ Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁ τὰ εἰκότα καὶ πιθανὰ Μωυσῆς ἀπαξίωσε, τὴν δ' ἀλήθειαν ἀκραιφνῆ μισαδιώκει. Id. de Sacrif. Abel. & Cain.

Thirdly, To pay reſpect to the Anſwerer. Who having favour'd me above others, with an *Anſwer*, as he calls it, to my *Exceptions*; I had no reaſon, I thought, to be behindhand with him in Civility of the like Nature.

Fourthly, To defend and right my ſelf. For beſides ſuch blows as are proper, and becoming an Antagoniſt

to

to give; and ſo ought to be born, or returned with Fairneſs; I am very ſenſible, that in this *Anſwer*, ſeveral Attaques are made upon me, from another force than that of Reaſon and Philoſophy; and according to other meaſures, than thoſe of Learning and Ingenuity. And truly in repelling theſe, my ſtile might well have been very cutting, conſidering what the Anſwerer has done to whet it. But as Truth may be defended without Railery; ſo I underſtand not the Wiſdom of mens ſharping their Pens, to ſcratch one another with them till the blood comes, meerly to make the By-ſtanders ſport. Yet he having been pleas'd to throw Dirt upon me, he muſt give me leave to bruſh it off again; and if any of it chances to fly in his Eyes, he may thank himſelf for it.

I thought I had had to with a genteel *Platoniſt*, and a Perſon above all Cynical Reflections. But he having made them in ſo great Plenty, I can do no leſs than take notice of ſome of them.

In a word; as the Anſwerer has thought fit to ſpeak *freely*, ſo the Replicant is forc'd to ſpeak *plainly*. For ſome he perceives, cannot, or will not hear, unleſs men ſhout or hallow to them; and to be mealy-mouth'd is a great fault, where to ſpeak out is abſolutely neceſſary. And neceſſary it is, where the cauſe will bear it, and the Truth requires it.

But before we enter upon our Work, it muſt be noted, by the way; that to facilitate his Anſwer, our Author makes uſe of *Two* pretty odd and inallowable *Expedients*. As

Firſt, he betakes himſelf too often to *Extraordinary Providence*. Where he is brought to Straits, and (otherwiſe inſuperable) Difficulties; he runs directly to *Extraordinary Providence*, to free him from the ſame. And as if that were to patronize his extravagant Phantaſies, he

he makes it a common Refuge for them. He readily aſcribes ſtrange Phænomenaes to it, and thruſts them for ſhelter under its Tutelage. And give any man but this ſure Clue in his Hand, and how can he be loſt in the Labyrinth of Philoſophy? Tho his Principles, Hypotheſes, or the ways he goes in, be very winding, croſs, and intricate; it will guide him quickly, and eaſily out them.

The Second *Expedient*, whereby he ſhortens his work and makes it eaſy, is this. Where Objections are made that ought to be anſwered; he frequently *paſſes them by with Silence*: and ſometimes juſtifies his ſo doing, by ſaying *the Theory is not concerned in them.* As if ſlighting Arguments, or neglecting of them; were a ſufficient confuting them. A Practice agreeable to the Country mans purpoſe. Who being reſolved to argue with a diſputacious *Quaker*; to his Friends diſſwading him, ſaid, hold your Tongues, for I will have a bout with him; and if he ſpeaks any thing that I cannot anſwer, I'll either ſay nothing at all to it, or elſe face him down that 'tis nothing to me.

Beſides theſe two *Shifts* that he makes; he tells ſuch *Untruths*; and falls into ſuch *Miſtakes*; and is guilty of ſuch flat *Contradictions* to himſelf, as will yield no Honour to a Son of Philoſophy. Leſt this charge, which may ſeem heavy, ſhould be ſuſpected to be falſe; in proof of its truth, the particulars are noted in the Margent of the Reply.

As to his complaint of the Excepters *Unfairneſs*, in citing the *firſt Edition* of the Theory for ſuch things as are left out of the *Second*; it is of no weight. For firſt, the Excepter never heard, nor knew the leaſt of a *Second* Edition of any part of the *Latin* Theory, out of which any things were left, that were in the Firſt; till the anſwer to his Exceptions told him of it; and whereas he adds, *Anſwer* p. 26. *Ib.*

adds, in way of aggravation, that this *Edition* was printed above a Twelvemonth before my *Exceptions*: My Exceptions, through the Printer's ſickneſs, were in the Preſs longer than ſo.

Secondly, for a Writer to leave *ſome* very falſe things out of a *Second* Edition of his Book, which he taught in the *Firſt*; is not ſufficient. To leave them *all* out, is the leaſt he can do, even to make the very *loweſt* amends poſſible for the wrong done to Truth. But eſpecially if he injured *Divine Truths*, by confronting the Doctrine of the ſacred Bible, or by claſhing with its Hiſtory. And this is that which makes what the Theoriſt has done in this Caſe, to be ſhort and imperfect. *All* the things of this Nature and Tendency, are not *left out* of his Second Edition. And they who print things that derogate from Scripture, or are repugnant to it; will hardly make good men believe, that they do GOD right, by leaving *ſome* of thoſe Derogations or evil Repugnancies out of a *Second* Impreſſion, while they keep in *others* that are as bad. The Subject that libels his Princes Declaration *highly* to day, makes no ſatisfaction by ſending out a *lower* Libel of it to morrow. No, his ſecond Act is an aggravation of his firſt; and as he is chargeable with, and anſwerable for either, ſo in point of Duty he is bound to moſt ſerious acknowledgments of both. And ſo is the Anſwerer to diſown *all* theſe notions (inſtead of defending them) which reflect upon Scripture. And truly ſhould the *Replicant* go on to tax him with thoſe notions, as the *Exceptor* did; he would have no great cauſe to blame him for the procedure. For notwithſtanding that he has *left them out* of his Book, his Rejection of them is not ſo expreſs, but they ſeem yet to ſtand, as *true*, in his Judgment. For thus he openly declares, *I have not from theſe Exceptions, found reaſon to change any part of the Theory, or*

Anſw. p. 66.

to

to alter my opinion as to any particular in it. And if his opinion of thoſe particulars, which we excepted againſt, and he has left out, be ſtill the ſame; the ſame Exceptions might, without *Unfairneſs*, be urged againſt him. Yea, his telling the Excepter, that his opinion as to the Theory is not *alter'd*, but *more confirmed* by his Exceptions; makes his *anſwering* Exceptions againſt it, by ſaying, they are *left out*; to be a meer *Shift*. Yet the Replicant takes but little *farther* notice of theſe things, as mentioning them but ſeldom, and on ſpecial Occaſion. Ib. p. 79.

That this Reply came out no ſooner, is owing partly to the *Fulneſs* of it. I was willing to ſay what I had to ſay to this Anſwer (and ſo to the Theory) once for all; that then I might finally have done with it. And partly to thoſe many interruptions and frequent avocations that attend my Circumſtances. But chiefly to thoſe indiſpoſitions of health, which happened to me, and hindred me, as to writing, for near a quarter of a Year together.

And now if in ſome things, or places, it be leſs pleaſing, or profitable, than the Reader would have it; he muſt conſider this one thing. That we do not here chuſe the Paths we go in; but are fain to trace another's Phanſy, and to follow his humour who leads the way.

CHAP. I.

IN this Chapter there is nothing remarkable, but the *Squib* which he throws at the End of it. Where he tells the Excepter, that his looking upon his Diſcourſe *as a Collection of Notes* &c. is *a ſevere Cenſure*. And then adds, *but every man beſt underſtands his own Works*. Which without doubt muſt be true of himſelf; elſe he could never underſtand a late Work of his own, to be *a true piece of Natural Hiſtory, and the greateſt and moſt* Anſw. p. 2. Eng. Theor. p. 96.

remarkable that hath yet been ſince the beginning of the World. As for *Solomon*'s, it was nothing to it. Joy to him of the honour he here does himſelf, in taking place of all of his own Order. 'Tis an high Complement that he makes to his Pen, may it prove as happy a one to his Perſon. But having caſt the Die, he muſt take his chance. And by this *one* Throw, he is either the *beſt Natural Hiſtorian* in the World; or a man that *underſtands not* his own Works. He is wiſer, that is, than *Solomon* in his way; or elſe not right in his Underſtanding. But the latter, we may gueſs, is the likelieſt of the two. For tho the King of *Iſrael*'s ran upon things of another *kind*, yet ſurely it was as *true*, and withal as *great* and *remarkable* a piece of Natural Hiſtory; as *the Theory of the Earth.*

1 Kings. 4. 33. *Tractavit Hiſtoriam Plantarum &c.* Grot. *in loc.*

CHAP. II.

IN the Second Chapter, to the Firſt Exception againſt the Formation of the Earth, *That it would have taken too much time, the World being made in ſix Days*: The general anſwer is this. *Either you take the* Hypotheſis *of an ordinary Providence, or of an extraordinary, as to the time allowed for the Formation of the Earth; If you proceed according to an ordinary Providence, the Formation of the Earth would require much more time than ſix days. But if according to an extraordinary, you may ſuppoſe it made in ſix Minutes, if you pleaſe.* But the Excepter had noted, how the Theory acknowledged, that to make the primitive Earth out of Particles, deſcending from above, muſt be *a good whiles* work; and that it was to *become dry by degrees*, after it had *done growing*; and that *the Body or new Concretion* of it was *increaſed DAILY, being fed and ſupplied both from above and below.* And can an Habitable Earth which is *a good while* in making, and

Ibid.

p. 59. *lin.* 24. *&* 33. *&c. Diſcourſe p.* 49. *p.* 51.

and *the body of which muſt be* DAILY *increaſed*; be made in *ſix Minutes*, even by *Extraordinary Providence* it ſelf? What made the Anſwerer ſtart out of the way of *ordinary* Providence, which he went in, as to the Earth's Formation; into this *extraordinary* one, to ſtumble into ſuch a *Contradiction* of himſelf? But ſo it is, when men are pinched and put to pain, they muſt do and ſay ſomething, tho it be little to the purpoſe, yea, much againſt it. And this grave diſtinction being beſtowed upon the firſt Exception, without more ado it is fairly dropt. And as for the Arguments contained in the reſidue of the Chapter, againſt *undue protraction* of the time of the Earth's Formation (which protraction is made neceſſary by the Theoriſt's Hypotheſis, even againſt the Doctrine or Hiſtory of *Moſes*) They are *left to the Author and his Readers, the Theory being not concerned in them.* And ſo they are anſwered by his *Laſt Expedient.*

A Contradiction to himſelf.

Anſw. p. 4.

But before I go farther, I muſt tell our Anſwerer, that in allowing this extraordinary Providence, he condemns his Hypotheſis of extraordinary Impertinence. For what *Need*, or what *Uſe* can there be of his *New* Hypotheſis, as to ſolving the Phænomenaes of the Flood; when by this Conceſſion, the *old* one will be inabled to the Solution of them all, for which his was invented?

Thus, for example, was that World to be drowned, and the Flood to ſurmount the higheſt Hills, fifteen Cubits? Why, extraordinary Providence, in *ſix Minutes*, could create water enough to do it. Was that work done by ſuch a prodigious Flood, and the Maſs of Water to be dried up again? Extraordinary Providence could as ſoon annihilate it. Was the frame of the World to be inlarged upon the coming of ſo vaſt a quantity of new matter into it? And to be contracted again upon its going out? Extraordinary Providence could ſufficiently provide both againſt the one and the

other inconvenience. Were men to live a thouſand years before the Flood? The ſame Providence could effect this, without a continual Equinox, or an Earth univerſally paradiſiacal. And thus the Theory, inſtead of making any Figure here, is by its own Author made to dwindle into a Cypher and meer ſuperfluity. We hope that henceforward the old method of explaining *Noah's* Flood, ſhall be allowed to be *rational* and *intelligible*: for *that* proceeded upon extraordinary Providence, and our Anſwerer is fain to make uſe of that kind of Providence in reference to his own Hypotheſis at laſt.

Yea, the truth is, he is now glad, we ſee, to take up with it at firſt, and even to *form* his Earth by it. And yet he tells us, in the ſixth Chapter of the firſt Book of his *Latin* Theory (*Edit.* 2.) that this Earth was formed, *ſolo ductu*, by the ſole *conduct* of the moſt known Laws of Gravity and Levity. And ſo this Natural Hiſtory. the Theory, is in good part, a *Natural Hiſtory* of what was done by *Divine Power*; or an Hiſtory of an effect wrought by *Extraordinary Providence*, which was done by the *ſole conduct* of *Natures* Laws and Principles. And therefore how *true* this piece of Natural Hiſtory is, and alſo how *great*, let the World judge; but if it be not extremely *remarkable*, I am much miſtaken. And ſo I am if here be not contradiction again.

Another Contradiction.

But tho our *Anſwerer*, as he pretends in this Chapter, be ſuch a friend to extraordinary Providence; yet it is evident, that the *Theoriſt* otherwhiles was not. For tho now his Earth (as he grants) might be made in *ſix minutes*; yet heretofore it was to be *increaſed daily*, and to be *dried by degrees*, before it could be habitable: that is, it was to be formed in way of *ordinary* Providence. And in the ſecond Chap. of the firſt Book of his *Engliſh* Theory, he tells the World plainly; that

if

if we come to reflect ſeriouſly upon it, we ſhall find it extreamly difficult, *if not* impoſſible, *to give an account of the Waters that compos'd the Deluge, whence they came and whether they went.* And adds, *to find Water ſufficient for this Effect as it is generally explained and underſtood, I think is* impoſſible. But had he been *hearty* for Extraordinary Providence, here would have appeared no difficulty, I am ſure; much leſs, extreme difficulty, and leaſt of all, impoſſibility. For ſuch a Providence could have *created* Waters to compoſe the Deluge, and then have *annihilated* them again: and as the quantity of them would thus have been ſufficient, ſo the account whence they came, and whither they went; would have been as eaſie. p. 9. Ib.

That this was one way in which ſome went, as to explaining the Deluge, according to the general or common Notion of it; the Theoriſt obſerved in his third Chapter. *They ſay in ſhort,* ſays he, That *God ALMIGHTY created waters on purpoſe to make the Deluge, and then annihilated them again, when the Deluge was to ceaſe.* But how did he approve of this way? That will appear from what follows. Where he preſently complains, that this is to *ſhow us the naked arm of Omnipotency.* A ſight which he could not well brook in this caſe. And why? Why, becauſe *this is to cut the knot when we cannot looſe it.* Yet ſee the change; he is now fain to ſhow the *naked Arm of Omnipotency* himſelf; and to make uſe of the Knife of Extraordinary Providence, tho with it he cuts his own Fingers, as well as ſeveral knots of his Hypotheſis; as we ſhall ſee afterward. Eng. The. p. 18. Ib. Ib.

And thus we have gained one extraordinary Point. An Earth that before was to *increaſe* DAILY, *in the Body or Concretion of it*; and ſo might be ſix Days, or ſix Weeks, or as many Months, or Years in forming; might

might now by *Extraordinary Providence*, be made in *ſix Minutes*. That is, our Author is brought to Croſs his Hypotheſis in this Matter. For now he ſuppoſes that his Earth might be formed in *ſix Minutes* by *extraordinary Providence*; whereas the Theory (as is plain from the cited Expreſſions) carries on its formation in way of *ordinary Providence*; according to which, the Formation of it *would require* **much more time** *than ſix days*, as he confeſſes, *Anſw. p.* 2.

CHAP. III.

THat the Moon was in the Heavens, and in our neighbourhood, when the Earth was form'd, he
P. 5. proves from the ſix days Creation, ſays the Anſwerer, of the Excepter, here. But his Argument, he tells him, *will be of no force, unleſs he can prove that the Fourth days Creation was before the Third.* No? Who ſhall be Judge? Why one that the Anſwerer *fairly* appeals to, and one it ſeems of the Excepter's own chuſing, namely *Scripture.* (I and let the ſame Judge, ſays the Excepter, decide the whole Controverſie betwixt us.) And what ſays this Judge to the caſe before him? Let all Philoſophers who pleaſe to be of the Jury, mind *his* ſentence, and alſo the *Appellant's* Argument from it. *The Moon was made the fourth day, and the Earth was formed the third.* So ſays the Judge, and very truly. *Therefore unleſs the fourth day was before the third, the Moon could not hinder the Formation of the Earth.* So concludes the Appellant, and very falſely in the caſe depending. For the Earth formed the third day, was *Moſes's* Earth; which the Excepter contends *for*, and could not poſſibly think that the Moon ſhould hinder the Formation of *that*. But the Earth he diſputes *againſt*, is the *Theoriſt's*, which could not be form'd the third

third day. For, according to him, it was not only to grow out of a Chaos, by the riſing of Oyl out of an Abyſs, and the falling of Particles out of the Air; but moreover was to be *increaſt* daily. And therefore had the Moon been made the *fifth*, or *ſixth* day, or *after*; it might have been made time enough to hinder the Formation of *this* Earth. But however he intimates here, that his Earth was form'd the *third day*. And that's mighty well; for now it's to be hop'd, that *Moſes* and he will agree better. Here's one ſtep towards an accommodation. But then the miſchief on't is, 'tis a ſtep backwards on our Author's part, and I'm afraid will do him but little Service. For while he thus endeavours to ſhun *Charybdis*, he falls unluckily into *Scylla*; is reduc'd to ſuch an exigence. that let him chooſe which way he pleaſes of theſe two, he is ſure to go in contradiction to himſelf. For if he ſays his Earth was form'd the *Third day*, according to Scripture; he then contradicts himſelf in his Theory, which teaches it was daily *increaſed*. And if he ſays it was *daily* increaſed, according to his Theory; then he contradicts himſelf in his appeal to Scripture, which (as he now owns) tells us it was formed the *third* day. And ſhould it be alledged (to evade this) that here are two diſtinct Hypotheſes (that is to ſay, of *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary* Providence) whereon theſe two different Formations of the Earth are reſpectively founded; this would be but the ſame thing over again. As evidently ſhowing, that in his way of ſhifting, he has ſet up two Hypotheſes plainly contradictory to one another. Even as contradictory, as affirming a thing made in *one* day, and affirming it made in *many* days; are contradictory affirmations.

Another Contradiction.

Ib. lin. 21.

The Excepter had ſuggeſted, that the Moon being preſent, and cauſing Tides and Fluctuations in the waters

Diſc. p. 74, 75, 76.

ters of the Chaos; *that* would have hindred the Formation of the Earth upon them. This, ſays the Anſwerer, *we have no reaſon to believe, according to the Experiences we have now.* For Tides hinder not the Formation of *Ice* in cold Regions upon the Surface of the Sea: therefore why ſhould they have hindred the Formation of the Earth, upon the ſurface of the Chaos? Some Seas indeed do freeze in ſome meaſure; but then their waters are pretty *ſtill.* And ſo the moſt that can be inferred from thence is but this; that if the waters of the Chaos were any where *ſo quiet*; ſome Earth might there have been formed upon them. Tho this Inference withal is far ſhort of being an *evidence* of the thing; inaſmuch as there is *more reaſon* for *Ice* to be formed upon the Sea, than there was for *Earth* to be formed upon the Chaos. For our Seas have *Shoars*, where Ice does uſually *begin* its Formation, ſpreading wider or farther by a continued or progreſſive Concretion. Which may be one chief reaſon why our Creeks or Harbours are oft frozen up (when Seas that feed or flow into them, are not) even becauſe they are bounded with no far diſtant Banks, where Ice can more eaſily grow from the Sides till it meets in the Middle. But the waters of the Chaos had no Shoars, Ice alſo is *lighter* than water, and ſo ſwims upon it; and therefore if fit chances to be broken in its firſt Formation, and while it is thin; it may unite and grow together again, by a new congelemeut. But earth is heavier than water, and apt to ſink; and therefore if broken when ſpread upon it in a thin Covering, it immediatly dives and goes down to the bottom. And upon this account, the ſame degrees of Fluctuation that permit Ice to gather upon Seas; would have prevented an Earth's being formed upon the Chaos. But we muſt go on.

Anſw. p. 6.

The Theoriſt thought that the preſence of the Moon was *leſs needful* in the firſt World. And one reaſon he gave for it was this; becauſe *there were no long Winter nights*. To which the Excepter oppoſed, that as there were no long Winter nights, ſo there were no ſhort Summer ones neither. So that ſet but the one againſt the other, and the preſence of the Moon may ſeem to have been as needful then in regard of the length of nights, as it is now. But this in the Anſwerer's opinion, tho *witty*, *does not reach the point*. And pray, why? why, becauſe *a great Inconvenience* attends long nights, when they *fall upon the hours of travel, or the hours of work and buſineſs*. But then at the ſame time that buſineſs and journeys are hindred in *ſome* places by *long* Nights; in *other* places they are helped forward as much by *ſhort* ones. And therefore ſet but the buſineſs and travellings of the Inhabitants of *ſome* parts of the Earth, againſt the like Concerns of the Inhabitants of *other* parts of it; and the Excepter's Obſervation will reach the point. And truly where can the preſence of a Moon be *more* needful, than in that World where *half* the time was ſtill to be Night; and 12 of every 24 hours, was continually dark all over it at once? that is, all over its habitable Regions. For then the Earth ſtanding in a Right Poſition to the Sun, and having none of its motion of *Inclination*, as *Aſtronomy* calls it; and the Sun always riſing and ſetting in the Æquinoctial, and ſo in the ſame points of the Heavens, without any Latitude: as the days would conſtantly be twelve hours in length, ſo the nights, by this means muſt be as long; but the *Crepuſculum* or Twilight in the prædiluvian World would be very ſhort, and ſo its Inhabitants immerſ'd in the deeper darkneſs, and conſequently could very ill ſpare the Moon.

Eng. Theor. p. 241.

Diſc p. 79.

p. 6.

In the next place the Anſwerer notes, that Oily
pag. 7. Particles in the Chaos, were excepted againſt as *Precarious*. And he endeavours to take off the Exception, by giving Reaſons for their being *Original* and *Primæval*. The firſt he borrows from *D. Cartes*, who *ſuppoſes there were* Original Salt *Particles*, and therefore *why may there not be* Original Oily *Particles*? But if *D. Cartes*'s authority muſt determine the Queſtion,
Mete. C.1.§.3. it will go clearly on our ſide: For he allows not Oil to be primæval.

Ib.

p. 7. Another Reaſon he brings, is *the vaſt Quantity of Oleagineous matter that is diſperſt every where; in Vegetables, in Animals, and many ſorts of Earths.* But this matter may be *bred* in them reſpectively. Thus we ſee living Creatures grow fat by Nouriſhment. And many Plants turn the ſap they draw, into very Oil it ſelf; ſo that we need but extract it out of their Leaves or fruits. (As other Animals again breed Milk; and other Vegetables, Wine, Cyder, *&c.*) And ſo in ſome Earths, oleagineous Particles may be generated; as others again are impregnated with Particles of a Sulphureous, Nitrous, or Aluminous Nature. And Chymiſts find *other ſorts* of Particles diſperſt every where, which I believe the Anſwerer will ſcarce yield to have been Original in his Chaos.

Thirdly, it is alledged that theſe Oyly particles were
p. 7. Original, becauſe they were *principles of Fertility to the New World*, and ſo could *not be extracted from the Inferior Regions* in time, foraſmuch as *that would require a proceſs of many Ages.* Why, therefore it is the more likely that the Fatneſs neceſſary to the Earth's Fruitfulneſs, was innate or *bred* in it. And we may juſtly look upon it as a gracious effect of that Divine Benediction pronounced upon the Earth, *Gen.* 1. 11. by virtue of which, it could not but be indued with all the principles

principles neceſſary to Fertility. And yet were it needful, this Oleagineous matter might be both eaſily and quickly fetcht up from the Inferior Regions. For tho in a natural Courſe, it could not be derived thence without Difficulty, and a proceſs of *many ages*; yet by *extraordinary Providence* it might be drawn up with greateſt Expedition, as well as Facility: even in a very few Hours, or (as we are taught a great Work might be done in another caſe) in a very *few Minutes.*

Laſtly, He argues that Oily particles might be Original, becauſe, according to *D. Cartes*, they were *tenuious and branchy, too groſs to be Air, and too light for Water.* It ſhall not be ſaid that they are therefore a Compound of both; tho it may happen ſo in other Caſes. For ſome Bodies ſeem to be made of a middle Conſtitution betwixt thoſe which on both ſides ſtand next them, in neareſt degrees of Phyſical approximation. And conſequently their Nature is but a *medium participationis*, or a compoſition of ſuch things as border cloſeſt upon them, and have the trueſt Affinity to them, as approaching nigheſt them in a kind of congenial likeneſs of Subſtance and Qualities. And certain it is, that ſome Oyls, by keeping, diſſolve into Liquors ſo thin and watry, that they will not burn; if that will give any countenance to the thought that water may be an Ingredient of Oyl. Tho it is worth noting, that *D. Cartes* in the very Section which the Anſwerer cites, gives an account *how*, and out of *what*, Oyl is made; and ſo is *againſt* its being *Orginal.* And ſince the Anſwerer refers to him *twice* in this point, let *Him* (till we can find a fitter Judge) decide the Controverſie. And indeed the very *figure* of Oily Particles offers it ſelf as an Argument againſt their Primævity. For they are ſuppoſed to be *branchy*; and whither can their *Ramoſity* be ſo well imputed, as to the Pores

p. 7.

Prin. Phi. l. 4. § 76.

of that Matter wherein they were generated; which being of ſuch a Shape, caſt them (as Molds in which they were formed) into the like faſhion? Of this Opinion is that ingenious Philoſopher Mr. *Rohault*; but therefore far from believing that Oily Liquors or Particles were ever *Primæval.*

Tract. Phyſ. Par. 3. *c.* 5.

The Second thing which the Anſwerer obſerves to be charged with *Precarioufneſs, is the Separation of this Oily Matter, in due time, ſo as to make a mixture and concretion with the Terreſtial Particles which fell from above.* And *this Objection*, he adds, *was both made and anſwered by* the Theoriſt. Now the Subſtance of his Anſwer was this. That the Maſs of the Air was many thouſand times greater than the Water, and would proportionably require a greater time to be purify'd; the Particles in the Air having a far longer way to come to the watry Maſs, than the Oily Particles had to riſe to the Surface of it. That there might be Degrees of littleneſs and lightneſs in the Earthy Particles, ſo as many of them might *float in the Air a good while.* And laſtly, that the Air and the Water might begin to purify at the ſame time. But this Anſwer is ſhort and inſufficient; and therefore no notice was taken of it formerly. But ſince we are urged with it now; to ſhew its lightneſs and incompetency, we Reply to it as follows.

Anſw. p. 8.

Eng. The. p. 58, 59.

Firſt, That the Air being a Finer Element than the Water; would begin its Purgation *ſooner* than That.

Secondly, Tho the Air was far greater than the Water; yet the Terreſtial Particles in it might ſooner reach the Water, than the Oily ones in the Water could riſe to the Surface of that, for ſundry Reaſons. As 1ſt, becauſe the Earthy Particles moved *downward*, and the Oily ones *upward*; and (*cæteris paribus*) the motion downward would be the ſwifteſt. 2*ly*, Becauſe the Earthy

Earthy Particles were more *dry* and leſs *clammy* than the Oily ones; and their unctious moiſture by rendring them ſlimy, would make them ſluggiſh, and ſlacken their aſcent. 3*ly*, Becauſe the Air was a *thin* and *yielding* Medium, through which the Earthy Particles would more nimbly ſift down, than the Oily ones could wriggle up through the Water, which was more *thick* and *groſs*. 4*ly*, Becauſe the very *Moke* of the Oily and Watry Particles is ſuch, that it would help towards their mutual *Complication*, which would retard their ſeparating; and conſequently the Aeral Maſs, would begin to refine *before* the Liquid one; and the Terreſtial Particles would have reacht the Water, *before* the Oily matter was riſen. For the Particles of Oil are of a *ramous* Figure, and therefore about them the *long* and *flexible* Particles of Water would * be apt in ſome meaſure to twine and wind themſelves. Eſpecially at *that* time, when they both (upon the Secretion of the Chaos) met and encountred one another in *ſingle naked* Particles, before ever they were once united in Bodies, or at all incorporated in their reſpective Maſſes. And altho by reaſon of their mutual Lubricity, the Watry Particles could not *long* keep faſt the Oily ones, about which they cling'd with tortuous flexures; yet they might conſiderably check and protract their ſeparation and aſcent; it requiring ſome time for the Oily Particles to extricate themſelves, and get looſe from thoſe little watry Wreaths wherewith they were involv'd and hampered.

* That Watry Particles are naturally apt to lay hold of Oily ones, appears from the way of cleanſing Veſſels, into the Pores of which the Particles of Oil have inſinuated or ſoaked. For out of thoſe their lurking holes, or little faſtneſſes, there is no fetching them but by the help of Water. And the ſame is clear from the Chymiſts Method of diſtilling Oils out of dry Bodies. For in order to that, they firſt ſteep and macerate them in Water; without which Preparative, there would be no extracting the Oily Matter fairly, by any force of Elicitation. But when through heat, the Water aſcends; in its fumes it ſnatches up the Particles of Oil, and makes that evaporate together with it ſelf.

Thirdly,

Eng. Theor. p. 55, 56, 57.

Thirdly, the *liquid Maſs* of the Chaos being *a Collection of all Liquors that belong to the Earth*; every one of theſe would at firſt be foul and *muddy*, and their reſpective Impurities muſt be diſcharged. Particularly the Water being a vaſt Body, would have ſent down its groſſer parts in great *abundance* of Sedimental Stuff. Now this Plenty of Sediment was thrown off by the Water, either *before*, or *after* the Oily Matter was riſen, or *in* the very Riſing of it. Not *after* it was riſen; for this Sediment being more earthy, and ſo more heavy than the Oil; it muſt be allowed to ſeparate as *ſoon* as that, or rather ſomewhat *before* it. And yet if it were diſcharged and ſank *before* the Oily matter was riſen, or *when* it was riſing how could it chuſe but ſweep away that, and carry it down together with it ſelf to the Bottom of the Abyſs? Or ſay, theſe Dreggs ſhould have been too weak or too light, to have overpowred the Oil alone, and to have ſunk it with its ſelf; yet it would certainly have *arreſted* its motion upwards. By which means the Terreſtrial Particles above, taking the advantage thus given, would have come poudring down amain (faſteſt at firſt, and alſo the heavieſt of them) into the *bare* Waters; and ſo joining their inconceivable Luggage, to the ſedimental Clog already hang'd upon the Oily Matter, would have quite over-ſet it, and weighed it down to the Interior Earth. And this piece of work will appear the more ſecible and eaſy to be done, if we conſider that it might be half, or better than half effected before. For all the Bodies or Elements of the Chaos, being of an *Original* or Primæval Nature; and not one compounded or made out of another: we muſt ſuppoſe that before the very firſt reſolution of it, they did *coexiſt* in the Chaos in their ſeveral Principles or Particles; tho they were not locally ſevered, and made into diſtinct and ſpecifick Maſſes till its Separation.

So

So that at the ſame time that there were *Earthy* Particles, there were *Oily* ones too, diſperſt throughout thẽ *whole Capacity* of the Chaos. And conſequently when the groſſer earthy Particles gathered towards the Center of the Chaos; They falling through the *whole* Maſs (even through every little *point* or *line* of it, from its Superficies downward) where theſe Oily Particles were diffuſed and lay in their way; they muſt needs catch hold of the *greateſt part* of them (the rather for their being of a viſcuous quality) and bear them down with themſelves: Eſpecially they deſcending in ſo vaſt a Quantity, as to be able to conſtitute a central Earth.

Laſtly, in caſe the *Terreſtrial* Principle of the Chaos, would not thus have hindred the *Oily* Principle, from doing its part towards the Formation of the Theory's Earth; yet then the *Liquid* Part of the Chaos would have hindred the *Terreſtrial* one in the ſame Work. For how is it poſſible that an Ocean of Water and Oil, ſhould ſtrain through the whole Circumference of the Chaos, ſettling down towards the middle of it; and leave earthy Particles behind, floating in the Air, and that in meaſures ſufficient, upon their Deſcent, to compoſe ſo immenſe an Earth as ours? Let the Air be filled never ſo full of duſt, yet a thin Miſt preſently lays it all. And ſuch a prodigious Sea of Water falling through the entire ſpace of the Chaos; could not miſs of the like effect upon the Earthy Particles then in the Air; eſpecially that Water containing ſo much *Oil* in it. For by the Virtue of its Unctiouſneſs in conjunction with its Gravity, it would have cleanſed the Air of Earthy Particles (tho very throughly incorporate with it) as Izing-glaſs clarifies fæculent Liquors, by carrying their Dregs to the bottoms of their Veſſels. And therefore, whereas it is alledged in the pretended Anſwer, that through degrees of Littleneſs and Lightneſs in the Earthy Particles,

many

Eng. Theor. p. 59. *many* of them might float in the Air a *good while*: we may rather think there would have been *very few* of them, if *any at all*, left there. And then where would have been matter for the firſt Earth, ſuppos'd to be form'd upon the Surface of the Abyſs? So we paſs to the Third *Precarioufneſs*.

P. 8. Which is *concerning the Quantity and Proportion of theſe Particles*, ſays the Anſwerer. And from this Charge he ſeeks to free himſelf by demanding to this

Ib. purpoſe. In what Theory or Hypotheſis are *Liquors Gag'd, and juſt Meaſures and Proportions of each* accounted for? But then it may be demanded again, what Theory or Hypotheſis has ſo much *need* of *juſt* Meaſures and Proportions of theſe, as his; and conſequently ſo much *reaſon* to account for them?

Ib. Then he enquires particularly; *has the great Philoſopher* (meaning *D. Cartes*) *in his Hypotheſis of* 3 *Elements, Or in his ſeveral Regions of the Unform'd Earth, defin'd the Quantity and Dimenſions of each? Or in the Mineral Particles and Juices——does he determine the Quantity of them?* Nor is there the like reaſon why he ſhould. For that great Philoſophers Hypotheſis, and this little ones, are not of the like Nature, they ſtand not upon the like Foundations. *D. Cartes* publickly owns his Hypotheſis, to be a *meer* Hypotheſis indeed. And tho for the better * explaining of effects in Nature, he ſearcht deeper for their Cauſes than they ever lay; yet he declares that he did not doubt, but the World was at firſt created with all its Perfection; ſo that in it there was a Sun, and Earth, and Moon, and Stars. And therefore here was no need of having his 3 Elements apportion'd in their Quantity, or accurately adjuſted to one another; becauſe,

* *Quinimo etiam, ad res naturales melius explicandas, earum. Cauſas altius hic repetam, quam ipſas unquam extitiſſe exiſtimem. Non enim dubium eſt, quin Mundus ab initio fuerit creatus cum omni ſua perfectione, ita ut in eo, & Sol, & Terra, & Luna, & Stellæ extiterint.* Prin. Par. 3. Sect. 45.

becauſe, by his own Confeſſion, there was no World to be form'd out of them. But is it thus with the Hypotheſis of the Theory? No, no, that's *a Reality* as its Author tells us. And it muſt needs be ſo according to his following Expreſſions, *To ſpeak the truth, this Theory is ſomething more than a bare Hypotheſis. The Theory riſeth above the Character of a bare Hypotheſis. We muſt in equity give more than a moral certitude to this Theory. The Theory carries its own light and proof with it.* And moſt fit it is therefore, that *this* Theory, being brought to the Teſt, ſhould approve it ſelf *far* beyond *others*. And an Earth being formed out of a ſtrange Chaos, (the Creature of this Theory) and according to the Laws of its Hypotheſis; as fit it is that the Ingredients of this Chaos, ſhould, upon enquiry, be found well *proportion'd* to one another; *beyond* the Elements of *D. Cartes*'s Hypotheſis, which arrogates no ſuch certainty to it ſelf, but openly renounces it. Yet if we compare *D. Cartes*'s Hypotheſis, in the *principal Inſtance* here alledged; with that of the Theoriſt; we ſhall find it will acquit it ſelf much better than his.

Eng. Theor. p. 85.
P. 149.
P. 150.
Ib.
P. 274.

For ſuppoſe the World had been really to have been form'd out of the *Carteſian* Elements. Yet, upon examination, it will appear, that they were leſs liable to juſt Exceptions, upon account of their poſſible *Diſproportionateneſs*; than the Chaos of the Theory, upon the ſame account, in regard of its *Ingredients*. For of theſe 3 Elements the *entire Univerſe* was to be compoſed. So that if they had all of them been *more*, or *leſs* in quantity; the Univerſe would only have had the *larger*, or *ſtraiter* Bounds. And if any of them ſingly had been exceſſive, or defective; nothing worſe would have followed upon this, but that the ſeveral Bodies made out of them reſpectively, muſt then have been proportion'd accordingly. Thus, if there had been

more, or leſs of the 1ſt Element, there muſt have been more, or greater; or fewer, or leſſer *Suns*. If there had been more, or leſs of the 2d Element; there muſt have been bigger, or leſſer *Vortices*. If more or leſs of the 3d Element; there muſt have been more, or leſs of *Terreſtrial Matter* in being. So that the worſt reſult from an exceſſive quantity of any one of the three Elements aforeſaid; would have been but an *alteration* in the Great World, or at moſt but an *inconvenience* here and there in ſome *parts* of it; no way detrimental or pernicious to the whole. But as to this Earth of ours, the caſe would have been quite otherwiſe. For had not the Materials of that been duly proportion'd, but one left to exceed and predominate over the other; this redundance, or inequality in meaſure, would have been of *very fatal* Conſequence. That is, it would have cauſed a *miſcarriage* in the production of the Earth, and have *ruin'd* the whole work which Nature was about. And therefore in making the Chaos into an Earth, there was abſolute neceſſity, as of Regularity of Proceſs in its Formation; ſo of due proportion in the Ingredients of its Conſtitution: otherwiſe it could never have been brought to Perfection.

From *D. Cartes* the Anſwerer turns to the Excepter, and thinks to choak him with an example of his own.

P. 9. *Does the Animadverter in his new Hypotheſis concerning the Deluge, give us the juſt Proportions of his Rock-water, and the juſt Proportions of his Rain-water, that concurred to make the Deluge?* And does the Anſwerer think, that the like accurate Proportion of things, is needful to *deſtroy* a World, that is neceſſary to *form* or rear one? Yet here a World was to be *deſtroyed* only; to be deſtroyed by being drowned. Now ſuppoſing the deſtructive Flood was to riſe out of Rock-water, and Rain-water; it mattered not, as to the Deſtruction they

they were to bring on, if both were of equal Quantity, or which, and how much one exceeded the other, ſo they were together ſufficient for the Work. But what ſays the Anſwerer farther? *I find no Calculations there* (that is in the Animadverter's Hypotheſis) *but general Expreſſions, that one* (ſort of Water) *was far greater than the other: and that may be eaſily preſumed concerning the Oily Subſtance and the Watry in the Chaos.* Here he muſt be minded of one of theſe two things: that is to ſay, either of *Shuffling*, or of *Miſtaking*. Firſt, of *Shuffling*. For he inſtanceth only in the *Oily Subſtance* and the *Watry* in the Chaos, which he thought might ſhift pretty well together, tho the one in Quantity exceeded the other. But he knows there was a *Terreſtrial Subſtance* too; and what would have become of his Paradiſiacal Earth which was to riſe out of that, if the Oil had not been fitly proportion'd to it? If it had not been juſt enough, that is, to mix with the Earthy Particles, and to make them into a good Soil. For if it had been *more* than was ſufficient to that purpoſe, it would have overflowed them, and rendred the Earth uſeleſs as a Greazy Clod. If *leſs*, it would not have imbib'd them, but they muſt have lain looſe above in a fine and dry powder, that would have made the Earth barren as an Heap of Duſt. And this, in theſe very words, the Excepter told the Theoriſt before. Yet here we ſee the *Earthy Subſtance* is taken no notice of, but rather ſlily ſhuffled out of the way. Unleſs he intended that what he ſaid of the *Oily* and *Watry* Subſtances, in the Chaos, ſhould be meant of the *Earthy* one too. And then *Diſc. p.* 80.

Secondly, he muſt be put in mind of a groſs *Miſtake*. For tho in *our Waters* that *Drowned* the Earth, one ſort may *eaſily* be allowed to be greater than the other: yet the ſame thing cannot *be eaſily preſumed* concerning

his Materials ſuppoſed to *form* it. For Rock-water and Rain water were both alike for Drowning, and ſo equally fitted to ſerve that End whereunto they were appointed; and the Exceſs of one above the other, could be no hindrance of the Effect they were deſign'd to produce. Yea, without ſuch an Exceſs, the Effect intended, could never have been wrought; according to *our* Hypotheſis of the Flood. But Oily Liquor and Earthy Particles, are very different things; out of a well proportion'd mixture of which the Earth it ſelf was to be made. And therefore to *preſume* the * one was *far greater* than the other, is to preſume they were not duly proportion'd or mixt together; and conſequently that the Earth could not be raiſed out of them.

*The Oil, that is, far greater than the Earthy ſubſtance; or that unduly proportion'd to the Oil.

But we muſt not forget the Cloſe of this Paragraph, which runs in theſe Words. *What Scruples therefore he raiſes in reference to the Chaos, againſt the Theoriſt, for not having demonſtrated the proportions of the Liquors of the Abyſs, fall upon his own Hypotheſis, for the* **ſame** *or* **greater** *reaſons. And you know what the old verſe ſays*; Turpe eſt Doctori, cùm culpa redarguit ipſum.

Anſw. p. 9.

Here he goes on in his ſhuffling or miſtaking Way ſtill. For he ſpeaks of Scruples raiſed *in reference to the* **chaos** only; whereas this refers as well to the *Formation of the Earth.* And he proceeds upon the *Proportions of the* **liquors** *of the Abyſs* only; whereas our Scruples referred as well to the *Earthy Matter.* Let *that* be included therefore, as it ought; and then what he ſays, will in plain terms amount to thus much. That tho the Rain-water were far greater than the Rock-water; yet there would have been greater reaſon why the Earth ſhould not have been drowned: than there would have been why the Earth ſhould not have been formed, tho the Oily ſubſtance had been far greater than the Earthy. For the Scruples againſt the Theoriſt's Formation of the Earth,

Diſc. p. 80.

Earth, can never, for *greater reaſon*, fall upon the Animadverter's Hypotheſis concerning the Flood; unleſs there be greater reaſon why vaſtly diſproportionate Quantities of Oily and Earthy Subſtance ſhould make an Earth; than there is why the like diſproportion'd Quantities of Rock-water and Rain-water ſhould make a Flood. Now have we greater reaſon to think that a little Terreſtial Matter, mixt with a vaſt deal of Oily matter, ſhould compoſe the firſt Earth: than we have to think that a little Rock-water mixt with a vaſt deal of Rain-water, ſhould drown it? There is *great* reaſon why one Tun of Rock-water, mingled with an hundred thouſand Tuns of Rain-water, ſhould drown a good Garden. But is there *greater* reaſon why one Tun of Earthy matter, mingled with an hundred thouſand Tuns of Oily matter, ſhould make a good Garden Soil? I hope, tho our Anſwerer be too great a Favourer of many Abſurdities, he will not be forward to aſſert this.

Rock-water and Rain-water were *ſimilar* Cauſes, and could not but with equal readineſs of natural Diſpoſition, conſpire to the effect of Drowning. And tho the one, in meaſure, was much inferior to the other; yet if both of them in conjunction, were but ſufficient for the Inundation; that was enough: for the Deluge depended chiefly upon the *quantity* of Water in general, and not upon the *Proportion* of this or that kind of it in Particular. But Oily matter and Earthy matter are *Heterogeneal* Subſtances, and therefore could not ſo readily and immediately conſpire to the Earth's Formation. Some *other Helps* conducive thereunto, were to come betwixt *them* and *that*; and *Concretion* for one. But then Concretion depending upon the *due proportion* of Ingredients; *Due Proportions* of Oily, and Earthy matter, muſt be *more* needful in forming the Earth, and ſo ought to be *better* demonſtrated; than the Proportions

portions of Rock, and Rain-waters in raiſing the Flood. And thus it is manifeſt, that the Scruples raiſed againſt the Theoriſt by the Animadverter; fall not upon his own Hypotheſis, for the *ſame* or *greater* reaſons. He might well therefore have ſpared his *old verſe*; which as appli'd here, was as inſignificant as an *old Almanack*. But ſince, in Civility to the Excepter, he would needs ſend him it; he cannot, but in kindneſs, give him a piece of it back again: Letting him know, that to reaſon, or anſwer at ſuch a rate as this, *Turpe eſt Doctori.*

Diſc. p. 81. To make an end of this point of *Precariouſneſs*. The Excepter alledged, *That all theſe things*, that is to ſay, The Ingredients of the Chaos, and the Proportions of thoſe Ingredients, and the right timing of their Separations; ſhould have been more fully explained and clearly made out, for a *Perſonal* reaſon which the Theoriſt made peculiar to himſelf. Namely becauſe he declared it to be his Judgment, that *things of moment* (of which nature was the *Formation* of his Earth) are to be *Lat. Theor. p.* 7. *founded* in aliquâ clarâ & invictâ evidentiâ, *on ſome clear and invincible evidence.* And what ſays he to this? To it he gives a double Anſwer. Firſt, that he ſet that *Anſw. p.* 9. ſentence, of which theſe words are part, *in oppoſition to ſuch incertain Arguments as are taken from the interpretation of Fables and Symbols: or from Etymologies and Grammatical Criticiſms.* But is there nothing then of a middle nature betwixt *Incertainties*, and *invincible evidence*? No πιθανὰ or ἀξιόπιστα, *Probable*, or *Credible* things to come between them; that he muſt needs over-ſtrain himſelf by taking ſuch a Leap, not *over*, but *into* a Ditch? For thus he plunges into this deep abſurdity, of tying himſelf up to ſuch an evidence, as he is not able to produce. But therefore he gives in a Second Anſwer, more to the purpoſe. *That this Sentence,*

tence, becauſe it might be taken in too great an extent, is left out in the Second Edition of the Theory. It ſeems then it was not taken in a worſe ſence than it might be taken. *Ib.*

Having done with the *Precariouſneſs*, he comes next to the *Unphiloſophicalneſs* wherewith the Theory was charged. The inſtance is the Deſcent of the Terreſtrial Particles from the whole capacity of thoſe vaſt ſpaces betwixt the Moon and us. And how could this Phænomenon fall in with a ſmooth Philoſophic Explication? ſaid the Excepter. For either the bounds of the Chaos, and the Sphære of its Gravity reached as high as the Moon, or they did not. If they did not, how could theſe Particles ever come there at all, or come down from thence? If they did extend ſo high, then as the Excepter quæried at firſt, ſo he does ſtill; why did not the Moon come down with thoſe Particles? It is anſwered by another Queſtion; *why does not the Moon come down now? the ſame reaſon which keeps her up now, kept her up then.* But this Anſwer, is no Anſwer: for that which kept the *Moon* up *then*, would have kept up theſe *Particles* too. And ſo either there muſt have been *no* Earth compoſed; or elſe the *Moon* as an overplus muſt have dropt into its compoſition. I think I have read of a Bullet ſhot up ſo high, that it never came down upon the Earth more. And then how could thoſe terreſtrial Particles deſcend, that were diſperſt in all that vaſt ſpace, contain'd between the heighth of the Bullets aſcent, and the orb of the Moon? *Anſw. p. 9.* *Diſc. p. 82.* *Anſw. p. 10.*

The Laſt Charge upon the Theory in this part, was its being *Anti-ſcriptural.* That is, in making the Chaos *Dark*, whereas the Scripture ſays, there was *light the firſt day.* He anſwers to this ſence. *That the Scripture does not ſay the Chaos was throughly illuminated the firſt Day*: That the light then was *faint* and *feeble*: and *P. 10.*

and yet *might be ſufficient to make ſome diſtinction of day and night in the Skies.* A fair Conceſſion, and enough to end this part of our Controverſy. Only we muſt obſerve that the Theoriſt in this matter has changed his Mind, and now plainly *retracts* his former Doctrine. For how could he think there was *any* light in the Skies the *firſt* Day; when he taught that the Matter whereof the whole Earth was to be made, was diffuſed in Particles through the Air; and that *after the groſſeſt of theſe Particles were ſunk down, the Air was yet thick, groſs, and* **dark**; and that darkneſs was **laſting** *Darkneſs*? Not that I reflect upon the Doctor for his Retractation here; I note it rather in his commendation. And the more any man does of this nature (where there is cauſe for it) and the farther he goes in this way; the more laudable will his action and procedure be.

See *Diſcourſe Chap. 3. Parag. laſt.* *Vid.* Lat. Theor. Edit. 2. p. 229.

Having done with the Chapter, he muſt now take the Excepter to task. And it ſeems he was in a great fault, where he little thought of being ſo. The Theoriſt doubted whether the Moon was in our Neighbourhood before the Flood, and he argued in Defence of this Doubt. This, ſaid the Excepter, is *too bold an Affront to Scripture.* But, ſays the Anſwerer, a **diſcreet man** *is not forward to call every croſs word an affront.* And truly no more was the Excepter *forward* to *that.* But every word *ſo croſs* to *Scripture*, as his ſpoken in the caſe mention'd, deſerves to be ſo called. It is ſaid in the Inſpired Writings, that King *Solomon made* **two** *Chapiters of Braſs.* Now ſhould any man doubt and diſpute this, and offer to prove that he made but *one*; ſurely here would be *too bold an affront* to Scripture, tho the things were little and of low conſideration. The ſame Writings aſſure us, that GOD, upon the 4th Day, made *two great Lights* (things of an higher Nature and Uſe) for they were to give Light upon

Diſc. p. 78. *Anſw. p. 10.* 1 *King.* 7. 16.

on the Earth; the one for the benefit of Mankind, ruling the Day; and the other, the night.) The Theoriſt queſtions this, diſputes againſt it, and offers to prove that inſtead of *two* Lights, GOD made but *one*. And muſt not the words ſpoken by him here, be *too bold an affront to Scripture*? And if they *be* ſo, *diſcreet* men may be allowed to call things as they are. Beſides, the Excepter had never ingag'd with the Theoriſt, but to ſhew how *croſs* his Aſſertions lie to Scripture; and had he not pointed out what was *too bold* and *affronting* that way, he muſt not have been diſcreet indeed, as neglecting what was moſt proper for his purpoſe. And laſtly, who muſt be moſt *indiſcreet* of the two, he that *puts* the affront upon Scripture, or he that *minds* him of it?

But he has ſomewhat *more* againſt us yet, for minding him of the Affront he put upon Scripture. And it is this. *Suppoſe a man ſhould ſay boldly, GOD Almighty* p. 11. **has no right hand.** *Oh might the Animadverter cry,* **that's a bold affront to Scripture:** *for I can ſhow you many and plain Texts of Scripture, where expreſs mention is made of* GOD's **right hand.** But let him ſhow us *one* plain Text of Scripture which *means* that God has a *real* right hand: That he has as *really* a right hand, as he did *really* make two great Lights. But becauſe he cannot poſſibly do this, the Animadverter muſt needs cry, *Oh how the Anſwerer here trifles.* As if there were no difference betwixt *Literal* and *Alluſive* Expreſſions in the Bible.

In paſſing to the next Chapter, he throws an Obſervation in our way. *Viz. Weak reaſons commonly pro-* Ib. *duce ſtrong Paſſions.* Which ſerves to inform, why the Anſwerer's *Paſſions* are ſometimes ſo *ſtrong* againſt the Excepter: even becauſe his *reaſons* are *weak.* Where *they* fail, out come *indiſcreet, rude, injudicious, uncharitable,*

table, and the like Brats of Paſſion; to ſupply the place of Arguments. And yet as to any thing of this Nature, the Replicant durſt not twit the Anſwerer, as he does
Ib. p. 5. the Excepter (in this Chapter) by ſaying it is *Wit and Scolding*. Not the firſt, leſt he ſhould tell a lye: not the Second, leſt he ſhould ſpeak in an unmannerly truth, and make a Philoſopher write in an incongruous Stile.

CHAP. IV.

In this Chapter he anſwers nothing as to what the
See Diſc. Ch. 4. Excepter objected againſt the *Central fire of the Earth*, and *the Origin of the Chaos*. And his reaſon is,
Anſw. p. 11. becauſe he *had declared he would not treat of them*. Yet as to the *Central fire*, he plainly *admits* or allows of it;
Theor. p. 64. yea, he owns it to be *reaſonable*, and to be *very reaſonable*. But when he has given ſo fair occaſion for Objections to be made againſt it; if then he will not defend what he ſo highly approves, and what is ſo nearly related to his Hypotheſis; who can help it?

His not treating of the *Origin of the Chaos*, the Ex-
Diſc. p. 88. cepter ſaid, ſeem'd a *Flaw* in his Hypotheſis. Here
Anſw. p. 12. therefore he vindicates himſelf thus. *When a man declares that he will write only the* Roman *Hiſtory, will you ſay his Work's Imperfect, becauſe it does not take in the* Perſian *and* Aſſyrian? By no means. But if a man undertakes to write the *Roman* Hiſtory, and begins at the *Middle*, or leaves out the *Beginning* of it; his Work will have a ſcurvy Defect in it. And the very ſame he may imagine it will be in a *Natural Hiſtory*; eſpecially if it be the *greateſt and moſt remarkable in the World*.

Ib. The reſidue of this Chapter he ſpends in *ſpeaking freely* of the Excepter. And he is ſo free as to tell him firſt, that his fourth Chapter *ſeems to him in a great meaſure*

meaſure Impertinent. But *he* is not to determine that *alone*: let it ſtand or fall as the *Candid* ſhall judge. Yet if it were impertinent but *in a great meaſure*, that implies it was not *wholly* ſo: but he anſwers to *nothing* in it.

Secondly, he reflects upon the Excepter for *dabbling* in Philoſophy. And when *he* will be dabbling againſt *Moſes*, why may not the Excepter dabble againſt *him*?

Thirdly, he condemns him of *Scepticiſm*. And he had much rather be *too doubtful* in *ſome* things, than a *Sir poſitive at all*. He does not pretend that all he writes, is *true Natural Hiſtory*. Nor will he *leave out* in a ſecond Edition, what is in his firſt.

Fourthly, he lets fly at him for *rambling*. But he rambled after *him* and his *notions*, as any Reader may ſee.

Laſtly, he ſays, he ends in nothing as to the *formation* of the Earth. How can that be, when he beſtows the greateſt part of that Chapter in diſproving the Chaos, out of which the Earth was to be formed? by ſhowing that *ſuch* a Chaos was not *created*, nor could it be *produced* in the *Carteſian* way; or if it could, yet it was not for the *Theory* to allow of that method of its production, as being enough to *ſubvert* its own hypotheſis.

This is ſome of that *freeneſs* of Speech which the Anſwerer is pleas'd to uſe towards the Excepter. And therefore he muſt not wonder to ſee ſome freeneſs uſed towards himſelf, upon more juſt occaſions.

But the Excepter in his fourth Chapter encountred *Two other Notions*, which are ſtiffly aſſerted by the Theoriſt. Namely, that *Moſes*'s Story of the Creation is to be limited to the Formation of our (lower) *World*, and thoſe parts of Nature which could be made

See *Diſc. p.* 99, &c.

Vid. Lat. Theor. lib. 2. cap. 8. Edit. 2.

made out of the *Earthly Chaos.* And that when he ſpeaks of the *Cœleſtial parts* of the Univerſe (the Luminaries;) he meant no more than that they were *then* made *Conſpicuous:* and this, if need be, he declares he could *demonſtrate.* But the Objections made againſt theſe Confident Notions of his, are anſwered only by being in part *left out* of the ſecond Edition of the *Latin* Theory. A farther Evidence that what he wrote, was *true and remarkable Natural Hiſtory.* And alſo plain *Demonſtration* in the caſe too. But then 'tis of the weakneſs (to *ſpeak freely*) not of the truth or validity of his Aſſertions. And withal here's ſome proof, that notwithſtanding the *great impertinence* of this Chapter, it reached the Theory in ſome things, which ought to be taken notice of, and ſpoken againſt; for they were ſo very culpable it ſeems, that they deſerv'd to be caſhier'd, or *left out.*

Ib. cap. 7. p. 232. Edit. 1.

CHAP. V.

HEre the Anſwerer obſerves the *Form* of the Earth to be Excepted againſt, upon the account that it would have wanted *Waters,* or *Rivers* to Water it; in that there would either be *no Rivers at all;* or *none,* at leaſt, *in due time.* But before he oppoſes theſe Reaſons, he gives a ſhort account of the *ſtate of the Waters* in his primeval Earth; and then declares (*p.* 13.) *This, I believe, is an Idea more eaſily conceiv'd, than any we could form concerning the Waters and Rivers of this preſent Earth, if we had not experience of them.* On the other ſide, I believe the *contrary* ſo *eaſie* to be conceived, that I ſhall not ſpend time in making it out. I only ſay thus much. In caſe his Idea *were* moſt *eaſie* to be conceived; yet what is moſt fair and *eaſie* in the *Idea,* or ſpeculation of a thing, is not always moſt *true,*

true, but may be moſt *falſe* in Nature. Look to the conſtitution or poſture of the Heavens. There the Æquator and Ecliptick interſect each other in an angle of twenty three Degrees and better. But the Philoſophers *Idea* repreſents a Paralleliſm in the axes of theſe two Circles, and a Coincidence in their Plains, moſt *eaſie* and natural. Yet this angular interſection holds, tho, it is thought, ſome Mechanic or Phyſical Cauſes would bring them nearer to the ſite we ſpeak of. And this very poſition, tho it ſeems to be forc'd and violent, and that as well to the Courſe of Nature, as the Philoſophers Conception or *Idea*; is yet the moſt convenient that poſſibly can be for the Earths Inhabitants; and by its laſting continuance, becomes a choice argument to confute the Atheiſt, and evince a Providence.

The Reaſon why there would be *no Rivers at all*, he notes, was *becauſe the Regions towards the Poles where the Rains are ſuppoſed to fall, and the Rivers to riſe, would have been all frozen and congeal'd.* And he goes on; *Why we ſhould think thoſe Regions would be frozen, and the Rains that fell in them*; *he* (the Excepter) *gives two reaſons, the* **Diſtance**, *and the* **Obliquity** *of the Sun. As alſo the* **Experience** *we have now, of the Coldneſs and Frozenneſs of thoſe parts of the Earth.* And what ſays he to theſe our Reaſons? As to the *Diſtance* of the Sun, he would make the Excepter anſwer that Himſelf, bringing him in thus. He confeſſes, **That** *is not the thing that does* **only** *or* **chiefly** *make a climate* **cold.** Ay, and that Confeſſion he keeps to ſtill, ſuppoſing the Suns Diſtance be *Perpendicular*, which was the Diſtance he ſpake of. But if the Sun moved always in the Æquinoctial, his Diſtance from the Circumpolar or Raining Regions, muſt be an *Oblique* Diſtance. And if that Diſtance were but as great, betwixt the Sun and the imaginary Raining Regions, as it

Anſw. p. 14.

Ib.

Diſc. p. 118.

it is betwixt the Sun and us, in the Depth of Winter; it may from hence be concluded, that the Cold in thoſe Regions muſt be as great, as, in Winter time, it is in ours, by reaſon of his diſtance.

As to the *Obliquity* of the Sun, the Anſwerer ſays it was neither ſo *great nor ſo conſiderable in the firſt Earth as in the Preſent.* But tho the *Obliquity* of the Sun be greater now, becauſe the body of this Earth lies in an oblique Poſition to him: yet his *Diſtance* from *us* in Winter is far *leſs* now, in this preſent Earth, than his Diſtance from the Raining Regions was in the primitive Earth. Becauſe that being an oval or Oblong Earth, its circumpolar Regions muſt be far more remote from the Equator, than if it had been Round or Globular. And ſo the Raining Regions then, muſt be much colder than our Climate is now, in the dead of Winter. For as it is not the Diſtance of the Sun alone, that makes a Climate vehemently cold; ſo it is not his Obliquity alone, that does it neither; but a *great* oblique Diſtance. And ſo great and conſiderable muſt the Sun's Diſtance of this Nature be, from the Raining Regions in the Primitive Earth; as to leave them in a very freezing Condition. Eſpecially if the *Experiences* alledged by the Excepter be well conſidered: to which there is nothing diſtinctly anſwered. Inſtead of applying himſelf to take off them, the Anſwerer is pleas'd to tell us thus. That *if the Excepter had well conſider'd the differences betwixt the preſent and the primitive Earth; as to Obliquity of Poſition, and that which follows from it, length of nights: he would have found no reaſon to have charg'd that Earth with nipping and freezing Cold; where there was not, I believe, one morſel of Ice, from one Pole to another.* As to his *belief*, who can regard it? It comprehends ſuch things, as no Chriſtian Philoſopher ever yet did, nor ever *can*, or *will* put into his Creed.

Anſw. p. 14.

See *Diſcourſe c.* 5. § 4.

Ibid.

Anſw. p. 14.

Creed. And as for the Excepter, he has *well conſider'd* the things he ſpeaks of; and ſtill finds he has ſufficient reaſon, to charge the primitive Earth in its Rainy Regions, with Nipping and freezing Cold: even with a Cold more nipping and freezing, than is felt in our Climate in the *Winter Seaſon*. Indeed he inſtances in one thing in this preſent Earth, which he thinks ſhould caſt the Advantage, for Coldneſs, on our Climate's ſide; that is, the *Length of Nights*. But conſider all Circumſtances aright, and the real Advantage as to Cold, will appear to be with the Firſt Earth; its Rainy Regions muſt be colder than ours. For in that Earth the Nights were continually *twelve* hours in length; and in our Climate, if we take one with another, throughout the Winter Months, we ſhall find that *our* Nights do not *much* exceed thoſe in Length. For tho in *December*, they be above *four* hours longer than they; yet in *February*, they are never longer by *two* hours and an *half*, and in the *end* of that Month, but little above half an hour. And then to counter-ballance, or weigh down this ſingle Difference, in length of Nights (the pretended Cauſe of prevailing or exceſſive degrees of Cold, in this preſent ſtate of Nature, beyond what could be in the prædiluvian World) we hinted ſeveral *other* Cauſes of vehement Cold in *that* World, which are not in *this*; tho the Anſwerer takes no notice of them. As *Ibid.* *Diſc. Chap.* 5.

Firſt, upon ſuppoſition that *That* Earth was Oval, the Wet Regions in it, muſt have been *ſeveral hundreds of Miles* farther removed from the Sun, than our Climate is; and ſo the Cold there muſt have been proportionably ſtronger.

Secondly, in the primitive Earth there was no *Clouds*; which contribute much towards warming the Air. That is, as they reverberate or beat back the Beams of the Sun,

Sun, reflected from the Earth: As they ſtraiten and compreſs Vapours in their Motion and agitation: And as, (at ſome times, and in ſome meaſure) they tranſmit the Cœleſtial Rays, not altogether unlike to Burning-glaſſes.

Thirdly, in the firſt Earth there was no *open Seas*; which fill the Air with Miſts, and Foggs, and great ſtore of Vapours, that do mightily thicken it, and conſequently mitigate the ſharpneſs of it.

Fourthly, There was no *Hills* nor *Valleys*, Ruggednesſes nor Inequalities upon the Surface of that Earth; which cauſe Heat again by confus'd and irregular Reflections of the Sun-beams.

Now put but theſe *Four Cauſes* of Cold (extant in the firſt World) into the Scales, againſt *the Length of Nights* in the Second, which the Anſwerer inſiſts upon; and they will not fail to weigh it down ſufficiently. Eſpecially if we add, that in *our* Nights, ſhorter, by *near Four* hours, than thoſe before the Flood; we have ſometimes very brisk kind of Froſts. In the *Beginning*, that is to ſay, or in the *Middle* of *May*; when the Sun is far advanc'd on our ſide of the Equator, in a World that has Clouds, and Seas, and Hills.

Anſw. p. 15. As to the *other part* of the Exception, *Theſe Rivers could not have been made in* **due time**: He anſwers thus. *That's wholly according to the Proceſs you take; if you take a meer natural Proceſs, the Rivers could not flow throughout the Earth, all on a ſudden: but you may accelerate that proceſs, as much as you pleaſe, by a Divine Hand*, And ſo this is anſwered by the *firſt Expedient*; *Extraordinary Providence*: which is here at a Pinch, brought in again, to ſerve this Extraordinary Hypotheſis. And thus indeed there might be Rivers for Fiſhes, and a River in Paradiſe; and the one as ſoon, and the other as great, as needed to be; even as big as *Euphrates* it ſelf,

ſelf. Here therefore this Controverſie muſt end, for who can ſtand out againſt ſuch an Anſwer? Only, we muſt ſay, it is a very *Philoſophical* one; and 'tis pitty he made not ſhorter Work in the Caſe. For he might have told us, that Men, and Animals, and all kind of Plants, by the power of a *Divine Hand*, lived *without water* before the Flood; and then he had ſav'd himſelf the whole trouble, as well of raiſing, as of propagating his Rivers. And truly ſo difficult a Work is the latter of theſe, that it will coſt him no leſs than a *Contradiction* to do it. For he tells us in his *Engliſh* Theory (p. 228.) that the *derivations of the waters, at firſt would be very irregular and diffuſe, till the Channels were a little worn and hollowed.* And (p. 229.) that *the Current would be eaſie and gentle all along, and if it chanc'd in ſome places to reſt or be ſtopt, it would ſpread it ſelf into a pleaſant Lake, till by freſh ſupplies it had raiſed its waters ſo high, as to overflow and break looſe again.* Now when at firſt there were no Rivers, but *diffuſed* waters; and afterwards they were to flow in Channels *worn* and *hollowed* by themſelves: When their Currents were to be *eaſie* and *gentle all along*, and to *reſt*, and *ſtop*, and *ſpread* at places, till they waxed ſtrong enough to run forward: Were theſe waters *accelerated by a divine hand*? No more than what is *natural*, is at the ſame time *miraculous*: No more than what is *ſlow*, is at the ſame time *ſwift*: Or than flat Contradictions can fall in with truth. *Another Contradiction.*

CHAP. VI.

PART of the Theoriſt's Deſign, in explaining the Deluge his way, was to *ſilence the Cavils of Atheiſts.* That is, by ſuperſeding the Miracle of *Creating* Waters, in that Caſe, and then of *Annihilating* the ſame; *Eng. Theor. p. 17.*

which ſeemed to him a Method *irrational* and *unintelligible*; and by making it the *effect* of *natural* Cauſes; and ſo, in his opinion, more agreeable to reaſon, and more eaſie to be underſtood. And accordingly he de-
Ib. p. 20. clares, that *the Deſign of his Treatiſe is to ſhow a way of making the Deluge fairly intelligible, and accountable without creating of new waters.* And in another place,
Chap. 8. *explaining the Deluge in a natural way, or by natural Cauſes*; he makes theſe Cauſes to be *Vapours* within the Earth, and *Rains* without it, and *Cracks* and *Chaſms* made by the Sun in the Arch of it. All which natural Cauſes together, brought on the Diſruption of that Earth, and this Diſruption occaſion'd the Innundation. But if his Hypotheſis which takes off *one* Miracle, brings on *another*; or (as the event of things might prove) makes it neceſſary to ſuppoſe *another* Miracle interwoven with the Contexture of it: it will then contribute juſt *nothing* towards *ſilencing* the Atheiſt, who cannot poſſibly be reconciled to Miracle, as profeſſing principles moſt repugnant to it. Now the great Flood being made, by the Theory, an Effect of *Natural* Cauſes; it muſt needs have come on in a Courſe of Nature. Yea, tho it was to come as a Judgment upon obſtinate Sinners; yet it muſt have hapned *inevitably* tho Mankind had been *Innocent*, or truly *Penitent*: unleſs the power of a *miraculous* hand, had forcibly ſtopt the Courſe of Nature, and held her from running on into this otherwiſe certain and inavoidable iſſue. And when it is as neceſſary to *admit* Miracle into this *new* Hypotheſis; as it was to *allow* it in the *Old*; how is the Atheiſt *ſilenced* by it? Yea, when he ſees this Hypotheſis making Ruine the Lot, either of a righteous, or repenting World; this muſt open his mouth, inſtead of ſilencing his tongue, and make him more fierce and clamorous than ever. This is the

Sub-

Subſtance of the Excepter's Sixth Chapter, which runs upon what the Cavilling Athieſt would be apt to alledge, againſt the Theory of the Flood.

It is anſwered thus. *What the Excepter ſuggeſts concerning Athieſts, and their preſum'd Cavils at ſuch an explication of the Deluge, is a thing only ſaid at random and without grounds.* And why ſo? Surely it muſt be becauſe of ſomething the Anſwerer had ſaid before. Namely, that GOD's *Præſcience is infallible, and God is the Author and Governour of the Natural World, as well as of the Moral: and he ſees thorough the Futuritions of both, and hath ſo diſpos'd the one, as to ſerve him in his juſt Judgments upon the other.* But is this to ſatisfy or *ſilence* the Athieſt? Can the Anſwerer think, that he who denies the being of a GOD, ſhould acknowledge his Attributes? and conſent to a Providence directed by *Præſcience*? This is as much as to ſay, let an Atheiſt become *no* Atheiſt, and then he will ſilence this Athieſt's Cavils

Anſw. p. 19. *Ib.* p. 18. p. 19.

The Two Queſtions he puts in the Beginning of his Chapter, touching GOD's Præſcience; are little to the purpoſe. Inaſmuch as the Athieſt, whom the Excepter juſtly brings in (the ſilencing of his Cavils being the aim of the Theory) does abſolutely diſown and diſavow the Property, together with the Eſſence of the GLORIOUS DEITY. However let us reply to theſe Queſtions; that nothing may ſeem to be paſs'd over, which but looks as if it required an Anſwer.

The firſt Queſtion is this. *Suppoſe* Adam *had not ſinn'd, what would have become of the* Meſſiah, *and the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel?* Why, then the *Meſſiah* need not have been born, nor need the Goſpel have been diſpenſed. And truly both the Incarnation of the one, and the Diſpenſation of the other, might have been prevented or put by; without any ſtop or interruption

p. 17.

in the Courſe of nature, made by the intervention of a miraculous Power. But the like cannot be affirmed of theDeluge. For had that been put off, the order of Nature muſt thereby have been broken; and the hand of Omnipotence muſt have ſupported the Earth by the ſtrength of Miracle. Elſe in a certain period of time, (in that Juncture ſuppoſe, when the Flood, according to the Theory, fell out) it muſt have ſuffered Diſruption, and have ſunk into the Abyſs.

But it is farther urged, that the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel is ſaid to be very **early determin'd**: in Scripture that is. It muſt be allowed therefore that *that* Determination had reſpect to mans Sin. But that the like may be allowed to the Theory of the Flood, it muſt be prov'd as well, that the Deluge was *decreed* or *determin'd* to come in, according to *its* Method. And where has Scripture determin'd *that*, as it did things relating to the Bleſſed MESSIAH, and his eternal Goſpel? But This, believe it, is a loſty Inſtance to be fetcht down into compariſon with a phanſiful Hypotheſis. The next therefore is of a lower ſtrain, upon which the Second Queſtion runs; which is This.

Ibid. *Suppoſe* Adam *had not eaten the forbidden Fruit; how could he, and all his Poſterity have liv'd in Paradiſe? A few Generations would have fill'd that place, and ſhould the reſt have been turn'd out into the wide World, without any ſin or fault of theirs?* To it we Reply,

Firſt; that if *Adam* had not eaten the foibidden fruit; yet it does not appear that he and all his Poſterity were to have liv'd in Paradiſe. For That, in a few ages, might not only have been ſufficiently repleniſht, but overcharg'd with Inhabitants.

Secondly; when that place had been filled, and *the reſt*, (as the Anſwerer expreſſes it) muſt have been *turn'd out into the wide World*: yet they (being without ſin)

ſin) ſhould not have felt the Inconveniences which *we* do. For as the *Barrenneſs* of the Earth; ſo, *many Inconveniences* (perhaps ſecondary Cauſes of it) might proceed from the Curſe of GOD, pull'd down upon the Ground by the ſin of man. And thus much *Moſes* has left upon record; that as the Earth by GOD's bleſſing brought forth uſeful Products, while man ſtood, *Gen.* 1. 12. ſo *Thorns and Thiſtles* were the juſt effect or puniſhment of his Fall, *Gen.* 3. 18. But then as the Anſwerer has noted, that *a Supernatural curſe might have its effect in any poſition of the Earth*: ſo it is as certain, that a ſupernatural *Bleſſing* might have its proper effects too. And if GOD, as he ſays, *can make a Land barren, if he think fit, in ſpite of the Courſe of Nature*: then in ſpite of the Courſe of nature, he can as well make it fruitful and pleaſant. And therefore *ſo* he might have made the Prædiluvian earth (had not *Adam* eat the forbidden fruit) notwithſtanding its oblique Poſition to the Sun. Then, as there ſhould have been no Death amongſt men; ſo there ſhould have been nothing like it, or tending to it. No ſuch exceſſive heat and cold, as now rage in ſeveral Climates: No ſuch noxious Vapours and Exhalations, as now riſe from, or breath out of the Earth: No ſuch impurities and unwholſom corruptions, as now breed in, and diſtemper the Air: No ſuch bluſtring Storms and violent Tempeſts, as now diſquiet, and toſs, and cauſe Breaches by the Sea: No ſuch mighty Floods and dreadful Earthquakes, as now do unſpeakable Miſchiefs at Land. But mens Souls being upright and clear from ſin; their Bodies ſhould have been ſafe from dangers, and free from ſufferings; and the ſecurity and pleaſure of their outward Condition, would have been anſwerable to their inward Peace and Purity.

P. 29. *Ibid.*

When

When *Iſrael* paſs'd through the *Arabian* Deſert, becauſe they were a choſen and peculiar People, and dear unto his MAJESTY; the ALMIGHTY ſav'd them from the great Inconveniences of that deſolate Region, by miniſtring to their Wants, moſt ſutable and ſeaſonable Defenſatives and Supplies. Thus, the Drieneſs of the place, and the lack of Waters; he ſupplied by the ſtreams from Rocks, Its Barrenneſs, or lack of Food; by Quails and Manna. Its heat and lack of ſhades; by a Cloudy Canopy. Its Wildneſs, and lack of Roads and Way-marks; by the Pillar of a Cloud, guiding them by day, when their Camp moved; and by a Pillar of fire leading them by night. The lack of new Cloaths, and the lack of new ſhooes; by the laſtingneſs of their old ones, and by their not wearing out. And when the Good GOD had ſuch care and kindneſs for a ſinful People; yea, for a ſtubborn, perverſe, and provoking Generation; as thus to ſence and furniſh them againſt the moſt grievous external Inconveniences, that could readily beſet them: we may well conclude how tender he would have been of an Innocent World, and how inconceivably gracious and indulgent to them, in the like Nature. The *wide World* therefore ſhould not have been *inconvenient* to *Adam* and his Poſterity (as this World now is to *us*) if he had not eaten the forbidden fruit. The ſupernatural Bleſſing of Heaven, would then have made their Circumſtances happy upon Earth. Nor ſhould they ever have overſtockt it, tho they had multiply'd never ſo faſt. For ſtill as they grew aged, that they might not grow too numerous, they might, in due time, have been tranſlated hence, as *Enoch* was, to the higher State of bliſs and felicity. Nor is there any thing here overſtrain'd in the leaſt. For tho we muſt not be too bold with Extraordinary Providence in the Philo-

Philoſophic Schools; it was ever a ſtanding Hypotheſis in the Church. And upon the principle of it, the moſt glorious Phænomenaes of heavens kindneſs, that have been, or can appear, are properly to be ſolved.

CHAP. VII.

HEre the Anſwerer applies himſelf to vindicate thoſe Texts of Scripture, which being alledged in confirmation of the Theory; were excepted againſt.

The firſt is that in the Second Epiſtle of *S. Peter. C.*3. *v.* 5. *For this they willingly are ignorant of*, &c. But he quarrels with the Excepter for rendring it generally *Wilfully ignorant*. Now who can ſay they were not *thus* ignorant? And is it not moſt probable that they *really* were ſo? Or who can clearly diſcern, and juſtly diſtinguiſh betwixt *Willing* and *Wilful* Ignorance; and rightly determine which of the two, men are guilty of in all caſes? It is hard to ſet an exact boundary, between *Willing* and *Wilful* Sin; ſo as poſitively to ſay, where the one ends, and the other begins. The Difference here is ſo nice and obſcure, as not eaſily to be diſcovered. If we look to the ſins of the Tongue; they that Ly and Swear Willingly; commonly do it Wilfully. If we look to the ſins of the Hand; they that Rob and Kill willingly; commonly do it wilfully. And ſo it is commonly as to ſins of the mind, and particularly as to the ſin of *Ignorance*. They that are *willingly* ignorant, are *wilfully* ignorant. For they are uſually ignorant, becauſe they forbear to conſult men; or becauſe they neglect to peruſe Books; or becauſe they refuſe to obſerve, or conſider, or examine things. And theſe Omiſſions being deliberate, choſen, and affected; muſt conſequently be *wilful*, and make their ignorance of the ſame ſtamp. Eſpecially if men *perſiſt* in

Anſw. p. 19.

in their ignorance, till it becomes high and hainous, by being cuſtomary and habitual; which ſeems to be the Caſe of them here reprehended.

Ib. And whereas the Anſwerer ſays, that the Excepter *lays a great ſtreſs* upon the word, *Wilfully*: *That* he did not do, nor was there any need of it. For whether they were *willingly*, or *wilfully* ignorant, it matters not; becauſe they could in *neither* ſenſe be *blameably* ignorant of *ſuch things*, as the Theoriſt preſumes they were; inaſmuch as they were in *no capacity* of acquiring the *Knowledge* of them, ſuppoſing they *had* been Real. This the Excepter fairly made out. To have proved them *culpably* ignorant therefore, in *either* of *theſe* ſenſes; the Anſwerer ſhould have taken off what the Excepter objected againſt the *likelihood* of their attaining to the knowledge of thoſe Matters: and ſhould have ſhown that the Pſeudo-Chriſtians reproved by St. *Peter*, might by the uſe of ſuch means as they *had*, have come to a competent underſtanding of *thoſe* Phænomenaes, which *he* believes the Apoſtle chid them for being unacquainted with. But the doing of this, he either willingly, or wilfully omitted; it being much eaſier to run out into an empty debate about a word; than (as he ſhould have done) to purſue the proper and material things. He ſays indeed (p. 20.) *The mutability and changes of the World, which theſe Pſeudo-Chriſtians would not allow of, was a* knowable thing, *taking all the* means *which they might and ought to have attended to.* Great news this, that the Changes of the World, which they were checked for being ignorant of, *were knowable by the means which they injoyed*. Did GOD ever blame ignorance, but in ſuch Circumſtances? But let him prove that the first Conſtitution *of the Heavens and the Earth, and the* changes *and* diſſolution *which happened to them at the Deluge*; were

Diſc. p. 128. 129. *&c.*

were **knowable things** to them, according to *his Notions* of them; let him prove that they had *means* to bring them to the knowledge of *these*, as he *represents* them; and then he does something. But he must first prove that there ever were such things.

And because he is for Instances out of Scripture, where the Phrase (used by S. *Peter* signifies *wilful* and *obstinate* ignorance; let him take these that follow, as proofs of as much. The forgiven Servant, *obstinately* refusing to shew mercy to his fellow-servant; it is said of him, οὐκ ἤθελε, *he would not*, S. *Mat.* 18. 30. The Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, *obstinately* refusing to come under GOD's Protection; it is said of them, οὐκ ἠθελήσατε, *ye would not*, S. *Mat.* 23. 37. And so again, S. *Luke.* 13. 34. Now if, ἐθελω, with a *negative* Particle before it, signifies a *Wilful* and *obstinate* **Refusal** of a thing; then, θέλω, without a Negative, may signify a *wilful* and *obstinate* **Consent** to a thing, or **Compliance** with it. And so the Phrase here, Λανθάνει θέλοντας, might signify a *wilful* and *obstinate* ignorance. *Answ. p.* 19.

And because he is for Proofs out of *Greek* Authors; one Proof shall be given him out of an Author that he knows understood Greek well enough. I mean the very learned and judicious Dr. *Hammond*: Who, in his Annotations, writes thus upon *this* Text. *The word* θέλοντες *seems here to be taken in a* sense, *not ordinary in other places, for being of* opinion, *or* affirming, *perhaps with this addition of asserting it* magisterially, *without any* reason *rendred for it, but a* sic volo &c. *So I* **will**, *I command, my* **Will** *is my reason.* And according to this excellent Annotator, the word, θέλοντας, imports *extraordinary Wilfulness* here. *Ib.*

Nor let him think that he gains any thing, by noting, that *it was not their* **ignorance** *that S.* Peter *chiefly* *p.* 20.

chiefly reproves, but their derriding *and* ſcoffing *at the Doctrine of the coming of our Saviour.* Foriſ he reproved them as *Scoffers*; yet in the *words conſidered*, he reproves them *chiefly* for their *Ignorance*, and in all likelihood, for their *Wilful Ignorance.*

p. 12. Next he checks the Excepter, for *Diſpatching* Scriptures *quickly by the help of a* Particle *and* a Figure. But if arguments be ſo weak that they will fall with a Fillip, why ſhould greater force be uſed to beat them down? The fault is in him that ſhould have brought ſtronger. To draw a Rapier to ſtab a Fly; or to charge a Piſtol, to kill a Spider; I think would be prepoſterous.

Eng. The. p. 86. He goes on next, to *Pſal.* 33. 7. *He gathereth the waters of the Sea, as in a Bagg: He layeth up the Abyſſes in Store-houſes.* Which, according to the Theory, hints that the Sea or *Abyſs before the Deluge, was incloſed within the Vault of the Earth.* In confutation of this Phantſy, the Excepter brought in that Paſſage, *Pſal.* 78. 13. *He ſet the waters as in a Bag.* Which proves (according to the known Rule of Expounding one Scripture by another) that by the waters being as *in a bag*, *Pſal.* 33. 7. could not be meant their being *incloſed within the vault of the Earth.* Becauſe this Text, which ſays the ſame thing, ſpeaks of an *open* Sea, *viz.* the Red Sea; and that when it was *ſo* open, that *Moſes* and the *Iſraelites* marched through it. How does the Anſwerer take off this Objection? Why, becauſe the Excepter had ſaid, that *as in a Bag*, *Pſal.* 33. 7. Should be rendred, *as on an heap*; and proved it by Authorities: he gives him leave to render *this* place ſo, *as on an heap. For*, ſays he, *it was done by a miracle.* But if when by miracle the waters in an *open* Sea ſtood on an *heap*, they were ſaid to be in a *Bag*: then this ſhows *more plainly* ſtill, that that Expreſſion, *He gathereth*

So the Vulgate *and* Septuagint *both render it: which the Theoriſt quoted for rendring the forecited place,* Pſal. 33. 7. as in a bag.

See *Diſc. p.* 139, 140.

the

the waters of the Sea as in a bagg, can be no manner of proof that they were ever *inclos'd* within the Vault of the Earth. And at laſt indeed he in effect confeſſes that he miſ-interpreted the *Pſalmiſt*'s words. For he declares now, that that *other place* (*Pſal.* 33. 7.) *ſpeaks of the* ordinary *poſture and conſtitution of the Waters; which is* not on an heap, *but in a* level *or ſpherical convexity with the* reſt *of the Earth.* And thus he catches himſelf in a trap. For if the Text ſpeaks of the *Ordinary* poſture of the waters, lying in a *Level* with the *reſt* of the earth; why did he wreſt and miſapply it, by making it ſpeak of an *Extraordinary* poſture of them (an invention of his own) whereby they lay *within* the *Vault* of the Earth? *Anſw. p.* 21. *Eng. Theor. p.* 86.

But the Excepter muſt not eſcape here neither. For he complains of him for an *unfair citation of a Paragraph of the Theory, which he applies peculiarly to this Text of* Pſal. 33. 7. *whereas it belongs to all the Texts alledg'd out of the* Pſalms, *and is a* modeſt *reflection upon the explication of them.* Now if the Paragraph belonging to *all* thoſe Texts did agree properly with *none*, and with *one* leſs than with the reſt; ſurely the Excepter might, without *unfairneſs*, cite and apply it to *that* one, without meddling with the reſt. And ſo the Complaint is frivolous. Tho how *modeſt* the Reflection he ſpeaks of, was, he may conſider; when it backs ſuch an *explication* of Scripture, as would make *Moſes* and the *Hebrews* paſs *thorow* a Sea, which at the *time* of their paſſing, was *inclos'd* within the *Vault* of the Earth. *Anſw. p.* 21. See *Diſc. p.* 140.

He proceeds next to *Job* 26. 7. *He ſtretcheth out the North over the empty place, and hangeth the Earth upon nothing.* But how can this moſt aptly agree to the ſtructure of the Theory's firſt Earth? when (as the Excepter noted) the Theory it ſelf teſtifies concern- *Ib. p.* 142.

ing it, that it *riſe upon the face of the Chaos:* And *could not have been formed unleſs by a Concretion upon the face of the Waters*: And that it had *the maſs of the waters* as a *baſis or foundation to reſt upon.* And ſo was no more ſtretcht out upon emptineſs, and hang'd upon nothing, than an Arch when built upon its Center. And but juſt before, the Theory contended, from *Pſal.* 24. 2. that it was *founded upon the Seas, and eſtabliſht upon the Floods.* What ſays the Anſwerer to this? Μηδὲ χρὺ φθέγγεται. Not one Syllable. We muſt take it to be anſwered by the *laſt Expedient.*

The next place is *Job* 38. 4, 5, 6. *Where waſt thou, when I laid the foundations of the Earth?———Who hath laid the Meaſures thereof?—Who hath ſtretched the line upon it?———Who laid the corner-ſtone thereof.* Where *Meaſures* and *Line*, ſaid the Excepter imply only that the Earth was made of a *fitting Accuracy.* And he affirmed that *this* Earth of ours, may be compared with, and be thought to outgo the imaginary *firſt* Earth of the Theoriſt's inventing, in Two things; *Comelineſs*, and *Uſefulneſs.*

But becauſe under the firſt Head of *Comelineſs*, the Excepter makes *Hills* and *Mountains* to be a piece of the Earth's *Beauty*; the Anſwerer ſeems much offended with him. Not at all conſidering, that at the ſame time he allows them to be *Irregularities*, and *Rudeneſſes*, and void of *Exactneſs* and *Order*; and calls them *the moſt horrid viſible pieces of Nature, and hideouſly amazing*, &c. Only they conduce to the natural Pulchritude of the *Earth*, becauſe it conſiſts in *Aſymetries* and a *Wild Variety.* Yet in reſpect of theſe the Earth is more comely, than if it were one vaſt plain, or lay every where in a ſmooth and regular ſphærical Convexity. Nor conſidering neither, that the inſpired *Pſalmiſt* (as the Excepter noted) did devoutly celebrate

P. 22.

Diſ. p. 144. and 146.

Ib. p. 147.

brate the *Wiſdom* of GOD, exhibited in making the *Mountains* and *high Hills:* which, if they had been nothing but monſtrous Scarrs or deformities in the Earthly Body, or the Rubbiſh or Ruines of a decayed Building; he would ſcarce have done ſo ſolemnly.

But as to making the Theoriſt *admire* the *Beauty* of Mountains; it was never in the Excepter's thoughts. Tho he takes notice that he was *mightily pleaſed and raiſed by the ſight and contemplation of them.* But between the *Beauty* of an Object, and the *Pleaſure* of ſeeing and contemplating it, there is great Difference. And (to turn the Anſwerers Complement upon himſelf) *he that hath not ſenſe and judgment enough to ſee the difference, it would be very tedious to beat it into him by* multitude of words. *Anſw. p. 22.* *Diſc. p. 146.* *Anſw. p. 22.*

The *Uſefulneſs* of the Earth in its preſent Form and State, beyond that of the Theory: the Excepter noted in Three Particulars. Firſt, in that it had *Seas* for Traffick and Navigation. Secondly, in that it had *Mountains*, for Bounding Nations, for Dividing Kingdoms, for Deriving Rivers, for Yielding Minerals, &c. Thirdly, in that it had *Rains* and ſeaſonable *Showres.* And that *Rains* and *Showres* were *proper* Rules whereby to meaſure the *Uſefulneſs* of the Earth, and to ſhow that it *excells* that of the Theory; is manifeſt from GOD's making uſe of the ſame, in a Caſe not unlike, ſaid the Excepter. For GOD comparing *Egypt* and *Paleſtine*, prefers the latter before the former; becauſe in *Egypt* the Seed ſown was *water'd with the foot as a Garden of Herbs:* but *Paleſtine* was a *Land of hills and valleys, and drank water of the Rain of heaven*, Deut. 11. 10, 11. *Diſc. p. 148.*

Here the Anſwerer at laſts chops in, and tells the Excepter how *unluckily it falls out for him, that a Country, that had no Rain, ſhould be compared in Scripture, or join'd in privilege, with Paradiſe it ſelf, and the Garden* *p. 23.*

den of GOD. *For ſo is this very* Egypt, Gen. 13. 10. *tho it had no Rain, but was water'd by Rivers. And* Lot *lifted up his eyes, and beheld the plain of* Jordan, *that it was well watered every where, (before the* LORD *deſtroyed* Sodom *and* Gomorrha) *even as the Garden of the* LORD, *like the Land of* Egypt. *Therefore*, ſays he, *the greateſt commendation of a Land, for pleaſure and fertility, according to Scripture, is its being well watered with Rivers.* But that's more than the cited Scripture ſpeaks, and more than it means; as will appear if we conſider the Occaſion of the Words, which is this. *Abraham* and *Lot* were both very rich in Cattel. Their Stocks were ſo numerous, that the Tract of land where they abode together, was not able ſufficiently to feed them: for their Shepherds ſtrove one with another for paſture. This made it neceſſary that they ſhould ſeparate; and accordingly they agreed to do. *Lot* having liberty to chuſe his ſtation, or the place where to ſettle himſelf; takes a view of the Plain of *Jordan*, and makes choice of that. And the chief reaſon why he choſe it, was upon the account of its being *well water'd*. And how well watered was it? Why, *every where* very well for the *nouriſhing of Cattel*, it being as well ſupply'd with *River-waters*, as a pleaſant Garden, or *Egypt*. I ſay, as a *pleaſant Garden*. For were the *true Paradiſe* meant here; *Egypt*, by being comparable to that (which was certainly the ſweeteſt place in the World) would have been preferable to *Paleſtine*. Whereas 'tis evident that GOD prefers *Paleſtine* to *Egypt*, *Deut.* 11. 10. But therefore there is no neceſſity that this *Garden of the* LORD, ſhould be the real Paradiſe. For the word *Lord*, or *God*, is commonly joined to ſeveral things in Scripture, in way of amplification, or to ſhow the greatneſs and extraordinarineſs of them. Thus we read of the *Terror of* GOD, *Gen.* 35.

5.

5. that is, an extraordinary terror. And of the *Sleep of the LORD*, 1 *Sam.* 26. 12. that is, an extraordinary Sleep. And of the *Trees of GOD*, *Pſal.* 104. 16. that is, extraordinary Trees. So here the *Garden of the LORD*, ſignifies no more than a pleaſant garden extraordinarily watered. And therefore, ſays the *Interlineary Gloſs*, it was *hortus delicioſus & irriguus*; a delicate and well watered Garden.

But ſtill notwithſtanding this, a Land watered with *Rivers* and *Showres* at once, may *excel* a Land watred with Rivers *only*. And upon this account Scripture commends *Paleſtine* above, and preſers it much before *Egypt*. Even becauſe it being happy in *Rains*, as well as in *Rivers*; it was free from that great trouble and ſlavery of *watering with the foot*, to which *Egypt*, through want of Rain, was ſubject. Thus the hard task which the Anſwerer conceited he put upon the Excepter, when he bad him *conſider how he would interpret and apply his place in* Deuteronomy, *and make it conſiſtent with this in* Geneſis; is done with eaſe. For albeit *Egypt* was as well water'd as a pleaſant garden, in reſpect of *River-water* (it being water'd by the overflowing of *Nilus*) yet it was not ſo well water'd as *Paleſtine*; which beſides a ſufficiency of *Rivers*, had moreover the benefit of *ſeaſonable ſhowres* ſuperſeding the trouble, of watering *with the foot*. Tho withal we muſt here note, that he would have put a trick upon us. For whereas he ſays, *Egypt*, a Country that had no Rain, is compared or join'd in priviledge with *Paradiſe*; it is not ſo. For the *whole* Country of *Egypt* is not brought into this Compariſon or Privilege; but only a *Part* of it leading to *Zoar*, better water'd than the Reſt. But theſe words, *as thou comeſt unto* Zoar, he left out of the Quotation; which ſhould have been in it, not only to perfect the Clauſe, but to clear the ſenſe. *Ib.*

ſenſe. So that *Paleſtine* had ſtill *more reaſon* to be preferr'd before *Egypt* in general, becauſe it was but one *particular Part* of it, which was reſembled to a fine garden; and that but in one *particular thing* neither, its being water'd by *Rivers*. Which tho they ſuted *Cattel* beſt, were not ſo convenient for *Corn*, as Rains: Which where they do not fall; the ſeed ſown requires manual waterings. And thus at laſt, the thing is fairly come about again, and *we* are juſt where we were at firſt, and ſo is *Egypt* too. For GOD, in *Deuteronomy*, compar'd it to a Garden of herbs, where the ſeed ſown was to be watered with the foot: and here in *Geneſis*, to a pleaſant Garden, which by reaſon of its Rivers, could want no water convenient for that uſe. But ſtill 'twas ſhort of *Paleſtine*.

And as for his *Interpretation* of the place in *Deuteronomy*, which he *likes* ſo *very well*; (Namely, *that they were not to expect ſuch a land as* Egypt, *that was a Plain naturally fruitful, as being well water'd; but the land they were to poſſeſs depended upon the Benediction of Heaven; and therefore they might expect more or leſs fertility, according as they kept God's Commandments*:) it is improper, and ill grounded. For it ſuppoſes the fruitfulneſs of a Land, cauſed by *Rains*, to be *leſs natural*, than that cauſed by *Rivers*, and it ſuppoſes the overflow of Rivers, to depend *leſs* upon GOD's *Bleſſing*, than the Downfal of Rains. Whereas they being both alike natural, and their Dependence upon GOD's Benediction, equal; the *Hebrews* had as much reaſon, and as great obligation upon them, to keep GOD's Commandments in *Egypt*, as in *Canaan*, whither they were going. Yea, (if a compariſon muſt be made) all things conſidered, they might ſeem to have better grounds for expecting fertility in *Canaan*, upon their obedience; than they could have in *Egypt*.

Ib. p. 24.

For

For rains depend *ſolely* upon Providence. (And therefore the giving of Rain, is all along aſcrib'd to GOD, in Scripture: And of the *four Keys* which the Rabbies put into the ALMIGHTY's hand, the Key of the *Clouds* is one.) But the regular and fruitful Overflowing of the *Nile*, depends not only upon the providence of GOD, but upon the pleaſure of a great man, the *Abaſſine* Emperour. For to him, as one tells us, the *Egyptians* pay tribute, to have the Flooding *Nile* kept within compaſs. And tho Providence can eaſily overrule Emperors, yet it muſt be allow'd, that *they* may well be more refractory than the Clouds. And thus again *Paleſtine* has another Advantage of *Egypt*, that it pays no Fees for any Rivers or fruitful Showres. It is generally attended with that privilege, which *Caleb* gave his Daughter, as an acceſſion to her Fortune: *the upper and the nether Springs*. That is, according to *Bochart*, *Rains* above, and *Rivers* and *Fountains* below. And where theſe meet, *ei ſolo nihil deeſt*, ſays he; there is nothing wanting to make that Soil fruitful. So that if there be any *unluckineſs* in this Caſe, it lights upon the Anſwerer.

Heylyn, Coſmog. in his Deſcription of *Æthiopia Superior.*

Judg. 1. 15.

To the objected Impropriety of *Foundations* and a *Corner-ſtone* in the *Circle* or ſphærical *Arch* of his Primitive Earth: he anſwers, that *thoſe Expreſſions ſeem an* Elegancy *to him. Whether underſtood as an* Alluſion *to our manner of building*; *or* as *an* Ironical *Interrogation, implying that there was no Foundation (ſtrictly ſo call'd) nor corner ſtone, in that great work.* It was but juſt three Pages before, that he flung at the Excepter for ſaying ſome Texts of Scripture (of which this is one) were *Figurative*. And now, we ſee, he is fain to fetch in a *Figure* himſelf, to help to explain this very Text. So that 'tis evident he will do any thing (even what he openly condemns) to ſupport (as he thinks) his

Ib.

Ib. p. 21. *l.* 16. 17.

tottering Hypotheſis; which when he has done all that he can, will fall at laſt.

Ibid. Then he paſſes to the following verſes in that 38th. Chapter. *Who ſhut up the Sea with doors, when it brake forth as if it had iſſued out of a womb?* &c. Here the *Diſc. p. 150.* Excepter gave reaſons why theſe words muſt refer to *p. 150. 151.* what was done in the Beginning of the World. (As alſo reaſons why by the Womb here mentioned, could not be meant the incloſure of the Abyſs, as the Theory would have it.) And none of them being anſwered (but by the *Expedient*, of *paſſing them by*) they (both) ſtand good. Now if the HOLY GHOST ſpeaks here, of the *Sea* when it firſt brake forth into *being* (which *all* but the Theoriſt allow he does) what *Womb* could it iſſue out of, but the *Womb of* Nothing? But inſtead of removing our Objections, the Anſwerer brings in two of his own; which the Replicant will not anſwer, as he does the Excepter's.

Anſw. p. 25. The firſt is this. *If you underſtand the* Womb of Non-entity, *the Sea broke out of that womb the firſt day, and had no bars or doors ſet to it, but flow'd over all the Earth without check or controul. Therefore that could not be the time or ſtate here ſpoken of. And to refer that reſtraint, or thoſe bars and doors, to another time, which are ſpoken of here in the ſame verſe, would be very inexcuſable in the Excepter: ſeeing he will not allow the Theoriſt to ſuppoſe thoſe things that are ſpoken of in different Verſes, to be underſtood of different times.* Now pray, what is the *difference* betwixt the time of the Sea's breaking forth of the womb, and the time of its being reſtrain'd with doors; that the Excepter ſhould be ſo *very inexcuſable*, for *allowing* that difference? It was but the ſpace of *one* poor day. And truly if he had *not* allowed of this difference; when GOD Himſelf *ſignifies*, that he made the breaking forth of the waters

ters into *being*, part of his *firſt* day's work; and the gathering them together into one place (the *decreed place*) where they were ſhut up with bars and doors, his *Third* days work: he muſt have been *very inexcuſable* indeed. O but therefore the Excepter is *very inexcuſable*, becauſe *he will not allow the Theoriſt to ſuppoſe thoſe things that are ſpoken of in different verſes, to be underſtood of different times.* Be it ſo. But were the different times of the *Theoriſt* then no more *diſtant*, than the different times of the *Excepter*? The ſpace between the *Excepter's* times, was one *ſingle* day: *that* between the *Theoriſt's* times, was more than ſixteen hundred years. And yet let him bring but as good authority for the Different times which *he* contends for, as the Excepter does for *his* different times (which GOD has clearly diſtinguiſht by different works; his *creating* Waters on *one* of the times, and his *collecting* and *confining* them on the *other*:) and his different times will by all be allowed. But becauſe he can bring no *ſuch* authority, nor any at all beſides his own; not the Excepter, but he himſelf, muſt be the *very inexcuſable* perſon in this Matter.

His ſecond Objection runs thus. *This Metaphyſical notion of the* womb of nothing, *is altogether impertinent, at leaſt in this caſe: for the Text is plainly ſpeaking of things local and corporeal, and this priſon of the Sea muſt be underſtood as ſuch.* Muſt it ſo? What neceſſity is there for it? None at all but to ſupport the Theoriſt's ſinking Hypotheſis. And for him to ſay it *muſt* be ſo underſtood in favour of that; is to beg the Queſtion. And however that may be leſs metaphyſical, it will be more *impertinent*, than our Notion is. For *that* we can preſently make very pertinent, by a way which himſelf juſt now cut out. *Foundations* and *Corner-ſtones* are as *local* and *corporeal* things, as the reſt which the Text *Ib.*

ſpeaks of. Yet *theſe*, he told us, in the immediately
P. 24. *l.* 15. 16. fore-going Page, may be underſtood in way of *Alluſion*. And let but this *Womb* be underſtood the *ſame way*, (as it ever was) and then the Notion will be *pertinent* enough. But who is impertinent for ſuggeſting it was not ſo?

The laſt place is *Prov.* 8. 27, 28. *When he prepared the Heavens, I was there; when he ſet a compaſs upon the face of the deep*, &c. That by the word, *Compaſs* here, could not be meant the *firſt habitable Earth*, as a Sphære, Orb, or Arch in the beginning ſet round the Abyſs, according to the Theory: the Excepter ſhewed very plainly. But what he alledged of that
Diſc. p. 153, 154, 155. nature, is anſwered only by the *Second Expedient* (which is made great uſe of) that is, it is paſſed by with ſilence. Yet that the Anſwerer might ſeem to ſay ſomething; he ſets up a ſhadow or *phantſy* of his
Anſw. p. 25. *own*, and then encounters it. *The word* חוג *which we render* compaſs, *he* (the Excepter) *ſays, ſignifies no more than the* rotundity *or* ſpherical figure *of the Abyſs.* Let the Anſwerer ſhow where the Excepter ſays thus. In
A plain Untruth. this he charges him falſly. He only ſaid, that by the
Diſc. p. 154. word *compaſs*, might be meant, either *Earthly bounds* about the open Waters; or the *Firmament of Heaven*, as a Sphære, Orb, or Arch, ſet upon the face of the Deep. And are either of theſe, the *Rotundity* or *Sphærical figure* of the Abyſs? Yet if they are not, (as they cannot be;) has not the Anſwerer done manifeſt wrong to the Excepter, by ſuggeſting a vain Phantſy or Notion of his *own*, and fathering it upon *him*, as his? This, to *ſpeak freely*, is fencing with an unlawful Weapon, which never commends either the Skill or Ingenuity of them that uſe it. He might therefore as well have wav'd the falſe charge here, by which he would turn the point of non-ſenſe upon the Excepter. For what can be more highly nonſenſical, than to ſay that the banks

banks about the ſides, or the Air about the Surface of the Sea, are but the ſhape or meer *figure* of it? This Gentleman in this very Chapter complains of *unfairneſs*.

And is it poſſible? He that does this wrong, in the very next paragraph cries out of *injury*. Of *an injuſtice which the Excepter hath done the Theory——by a falſe accuſation. For he ſays, the Theory makes the Conſtruction of the firſt Earth to have been* meerly Mechanical. And did it not make it ſo? *Proferte tabulas.* How read we in the beginning of the Sixth Chapter of the Latin Theory? *Secutus ſum leges notiſſimas gravitatis & levitatis, & earum* ſolo ductu *vidimus maſſam illam primigeniam——perveniſſe tandem in formam ſtabilem regionis terræ. I have followed the moſt known laws of gravity and levity, and by the* ſole leading *of them we have ſeen that primigenial Maſs to have come at length into the ſteddy form of a Region of earth.* Now that Body which is led into its form by the *laws of Gravity and Levity*, muſt certainly be made *Mechanically*. And the Earth being brought into its form, by the **ſole** *guidance* of thoſe Laws, its formation muſt be **meerly** *Mechanical*. And then upon whom reſts the Injuſtice here, and the guilt of raiſing a *falſe accuſation*? But for all this, the Anſwerer ſays; *That the Conſtruction* of the Earth *was not meerly Mechanical, in the opinion of the Theoriſt, you may ſee*, Eng. Theor. p. 65. That is, he ſays and unſays; and is ſo like a *Proteus* in his Philoſophy, that 'tis hard to diſcern his ſhape and colour.

Anſw. p. 26.

Edit. 2.

A plain Untruth.

Then he brings two other Complaints againſt the Excepter. One, for *citing the firſt Edition of the Theory; for things left out in the Second.* The other, for *defective Citations.* The firſt, had its anſwer in the beginning of the Reply. The Second, muſt be better made out before it can deſerve one. And

Anſw. p. 26.

In the *Introduction.*

And whereas to ſhew that the aforeſaid Places of Scripture, cited by the Theory, were but *figurative*;
Diſc. p. 155. the Excepter confronted them with that one Text (inſtead of many) *who ſhaketh the Earth out of her place, and the Pillars thereof tremble*; which cannot be *literally* interpreted: The Anſwerer will not allow *Pillars* there to be underſtood *literally*, for this worthy reaſon.
Anſw. p. 27. Even *becauſe there are no ſuch Pillars of the Earth upon any Hypotheſis.* So that it ſeems *Hypotheſes* are not to be regulated by *Scripture-Expreſſions*, but the ſignification or ſenſe of *them*, is to be overul'd and determin'd by *Hypotheſes*. At which rate, the *Hands* and *Eyes* of ALMIGHTY GOD, in the holy Bible, *muſt* be, or at leaſt *may* be underſtood *literally*; as being agreeable to the Hypotheſis of the *Anthropomorphites*.

CHAP. VIII.

THis Chapter treats of the perpetual *Equinox* of the Theory, before the Flood. And the Anſwerer would fain make the World believe, that the Excepter *thinks* that the Earth (when it changed its ſuppoſed Situation or Right Poſition to the Sun) was *tranſlated from the* Equator *into the* Ecliptick: *and*
N. *that before the change, in the Antediluvian ſtate, it moved directly under the* Equator. A pretty Miſtake indeed, had it been really thus. But we ſhall ſee it proved, juſt as ſome other falſe Charges have been. However to ſhow that his Will is good, he endeavours to ſqueeze Evidence out of theſe (the Excepter's) words. *So that in her annual motion about the Sun, ſhe was carried directly under the Equinoctial, without any manner of obliquity in her ſite, or declination towards either of the Tropics, in her courſe: And therefore could never cut the Equinoctial, by paſſing (as now ſhe is preſum'd*

ſum'd to do) from one Tropic to the other. Now pray, was not the Ecliptic, the Equinoctial in the Theoriſt's firſt World? And was not the Earth carried directly under the Equinoctial? And was not that World without Tropics? And muſt it not be true then that the Earth never cut the Equinoctial, by paſſing (as ſhe is now preſum'd to do) from one Tropic to the other? But where does the Excepter ſpeak a word here, of her being *tranſlated from the Equator*, at the change of her poſition? or of her *moving directly under it, in the Antediluvian ſtate*? So far was he from that, that what he ſays, is of the quite contrary Importance. As ſhewing that the Earth moved always under the *Equinoctial* of the Prædiluvian World, which was the *Ecliptick*; and could not *poſſibly* have an Excurſion to the Tropics, as now ſhe has: For in that State there were no ſuch things. And beſides that the words cited carry this ſenſe moſt plainly in them, the Excepter, in the very Sentence immediatly preceding them, declares; that by the Earth's *right ſituation to the Sun, is meant that the axis of the Earth was always kept in a Paralleliſm to that of the* Ecliptick. And could it then *in the Antediluvian ſtate, move directly under the* Equator? Or could the Anſwerer *perceive* (as his word is) that the Excepter *thought* it did ſo? Then his Perception was more quick than true. And now it is to be hop'd that he will better perceive, that he might have ſpar'd thoſe *Leavers* and *Pullies*, he ſpeaks of for removing the Earth. And ſo he might have done the unlucky *Screws* of this unhappy Miſtake, whereby he would have forc'd the Excepters words, into a crooked meaning: but they only make his own Obſervation ſtand awry.

Diſc. p. 158.

Anſw. p. 27.

A miſtake.

But that the Earth had a *Direct Situation to the Sun*, cauſing a *perpetual Equinox*; *is very unlikely*, ſaid the Excepter,

Diſc. p. 159. Excepter, for this Reaſon. Becauſe then the ſame would have remained until now, or elſe in the World there would have been found *a more full account of the Change thereof.* To this the Anſwerer oppoſes, that *Anſw. p.* 28. *other things are loſt out of memory.* And inſtances in *two*, the *Age of the World, and the place of Paradiſe.* But *Time* and *Place* are but *Circumſtances* of things, and ſo might ſooner and more eaſily ſlip out of mind. Whereas the Loſs of the Equinox, by the variation of the Earth's Poſition would not only have been a real, but a mighty *thing.* For it muſt have been attended not only with a ſtrange Alteration as to Seaſons of the year, as to the Temperature of the Air, and as to the condition of the Earth; but alſo with ſenſible Effects upon the Bodies of men, as Heat, Cold, &c. Which Effects would not only have cauſed *Noah* and his Family to Obſerve this Change, (ſo mighty in its Conſequences as well as in it ſelf) but likewiſe would have ſo far imprinted, and ſet home the Obſervation upon them; as to have given occaſion to a laſting traditional Remembrance of the ſame. And what if the juſt *Age* of the World be loſt, (the *Hebrews, Greeks*, and *Latins* differing about it;) and Chronology being a difficult thing, ſubject to innumerable intricacies and entanglements?) Yet 'tis clear enough that the World had a *Beginning.* And what if we be at a loſs for the true *Place* of Paradiſe, which was known to none but *Adam* and *Eve*; and which GOD perhaps deſign'd to bury out of the memory of men, as he did *Moſes*'s Body out of *Iſrael*'s knowledge, to prevent Superſtition? Yet ſtill that there was a *Paradiſe*, is moſt certain. But *this* is that which the pretended Equinox fails in; in the *truth* or *certainty* of its *Exiſtence.* We have no Evidence, no *clear* and *convincing* Evidence to prove that it ever *was* in Nature.

The

The Excepter farther objected, that *Scripture* does not *favour* this Equinox, but rather *diſcountenance* it. And to make the Objection good, he cited *Gen.* 8. 22. *While the Earth remaineth, ſeed time and harveſt, and cold and heat, and ſummer and winter, and night and day ſhall not ceaſe.* Which place the Anſwerer owns, *may be underſtood of the reſtauration of a* former order *in the Seaſons of the year*; and ſo by his own Confeſſion, it is good evidence on our ſide. And whereas he tells of *Reaſons* which *the Theoriſt ſet down, to make it probable, that* the words *ought to be underſtood as a Declaration of ſuch an Order for the Seaſons of the Year, as was brought in at that time*; which Reaſons *the Excepter hath not thought fit to take notice of, or refute*: Theſe Reaſons ſeem to be the *perpetual Equinox*, the *Longævity of the Antediluvians*, and the *Appearance of the Rainbow, firſt* in the new World. But before ſuch Phænomonaes can be offered as good *Reaſons* to prove *other* things, they muſt be better eſtabliſht *themſelves*. To go about to prove one part of an Hypotheſis, by another part of it, when the whole is queſtioned, and lies under debate; is no allowable way of proceeding. Yet theſe Reaſons the Excepter did take ſufficient notice of.

Diſc. p. 166. *Anſw. p.* 29. *Ib.*

But the Anſwerer's finding fault with the Excepter here, for not *taking notice of Reaſons*; puts him upon a more juſt, and moſt ſeaſonable Recrimination. For *five* Inſtances heing alledg'd by the Excepter, in proof of what he affirmed of the *Scripture*; *viz.* that it rather *diſcountenances* the Equinox than favours it: He anſwers *three* of them, only by his *laſt Expedient*; that is, by paſſing them by.

Diſc. p. 166, 167, 168.

To the *Fourth*, being the *Barrenneſs of the Earth*, from the divine Malediction denounc'd againſt it for *Adam's* ſin; which Barrenneſs is utterly *inconſiſtent* with the Doctrine of the Equinox: his Anſwer is this. *That*

Anſw. p. 29.

Curſe was ſupernatural, and might have its effect in any Poſition of the Earth. But then this Effect overthrows his Hypotheſis, which maintains *a perpetual Spring to all the World, and a continual verdure of the Earth.* Eng. Theor. p. 196.

Diſc. p. 169. Laſtly, *the Intemperature of the Air in Paradiſe*, inferred from the *Coats of Skins*, made by GOD, to cloth the Protoplaſts with, and defend them from cold; was brought in as an Inſtance to ſhow that Scripture does not favour the Equinox but *diſcountenance* it. And *Anſw. p.* 30. to this it is anſwered thus. *He* (the Excepter) *muſt tell us in what Climate he ſuppoſes Paradiſe to have ſtood: and which way and how far,* Adam *and* Eve *were baniſht from it. When thoſe things are determin'd, we ſhall know what to Judge of his Argument, and of* Coats of skins. In the mean time he may pleaſe to conſider theſe Four *Diſc. p. 169, 170* things. First, that it has been already ſhewed, that in all likelihood theſe coats of skins were made to defend our firſt Parents from Cold. Secondly, that for ought appears in the ſacred Story, they were clothed with theſe Coats, *before* they were turned out of Paradiſe. Thirdly, that they could not be baniſht *far* from it, becauſe when they were thrown out of it, Cherubim were ſet to guard the Entrance, leſt they ſhould return into it again. And therefore if Paradiſe ſtood in a pleaſant and temperate Region of the Earth (as who can think otherwiſe?) they may be ſuppoſed (for a great while) to abide in the *Neighbourhood* of it. Fourthly, Suppoſe them baniſht which way you will, and as far from it as you pleaſe; yet they could have needed no Coats to *defend them from Cold*, in caſe the Theory's Hypotheſis were true. For according to that, in *Eng. Theor. p.* 251. the primæval Earth, *we have every where through the temperate Climates, all the general Characters of Paradiſe, ſo that the trouble will be rather in that competition, what*

what part or Region to pitch upon in particular: than *to find a ſeat that had all thoſe beauties and conveniences.* And therefore had *Adam* and *Eve* been baniſht never ſo far from Paradiſe into any temperate Climates (and none were then intemperate but thoſe that were alſo uninhabitable) yet they muſt ſtill have been in Paradiſiacal Regions and circumſtances; and ſo could have needed no Coats of Skins. But GOD being pleaſed to make them ſuch Coats to defend them from the Cold, this ſubverts the General Paradiſiacalneſs of the primitive Earth, and conſequently its Equinox; by implying there was a cold or intemperate air, in the habitable parts of it.

The Anſwerer proceeds thus in the next Paragraph. *After* **Laſtly**, *I expected no more: but he hath two or three Reaſons after the Laſt.* Thus he cannot forbear playing upon the Excepter, tho he does it with the worſt luck that ever man had. For even by this Reflection (intended to diſparage *him*) he only expoſes *himſelf*, by betraying and proclaiming his own Inadvertency. For the *Laſtly* he notes, plainly belongs (as any one may ſee) to the *Laſt* of the *Inſtances* ſhewing that *Scripture* does not favour the Equinox. But ſtill the *Reaſons* againſt the *Equinox* alledged in that Chapter, might follow in their due Courſe or Order. So that tho it be about a *little* thing, he here again falls into a *great* miſtake. *Anſw. p.* 30. *Diſc. p.* 169.

Another Miſtake.

The next Argument of the Excepter's againſt the Equinox, is, That it would have kept one Hemiſpære of the terreſtrial Globe *unpeopled.* For grant *Adam* to have been planted on either ſide of the *Torrid Zone*, ſuch was the fiery heat thereof, that neither *he* nor *his* could have gone through it to the other ſide. And here the Anſwerer is ſo put to it, that he is forc'd to betake himſelf to his *firſt Expedient* to ſolve the Objection *Ib. p.* 171.

Anſw. p. 30. ction by *Extraordinary Providence.* Telling us that *the Theoriſt never excluded the Miniſtery of Angels; and they could as eaſily carry them through the Torrid Zone, as over the Ocean.* As for Angels carrying men over the *Ocean*, let him blame thoſe that aſſert it: he knows the Excepter to be very clear from it. But if he will have them carried through the *Torrid Zone* by their miraculous Miniſtery; he muſt remember, that this is *to ſhow us the arm of Omnipotency, and to cut the knot when we cannot looſe it.* Tho had Providence ſhown this ſignal favour to Mankind, we need not queſtion but it would have been entred in the Records of Heaven. But the inſpired Writings remember nothing of it.

See *Diſc. ch.* 11. §7.

Eng. Theor. p. 18.

Another Reaſon brought by the Excepter why there could be no Equinox, is, that it would have *put by the Rains* which help'd to *raiſe the Flood.* And here the Philoſopher is fain to run to his old Refuge again, and to anſwer (by the ſame *Expedient*) *That thoſe rains that made the Flood were* Extraordinary, *and out of the courſe of Nature.* But this is little leſs than giving up his Hypotheſis; at leaſt it is condemning it as weak and inſufficient. And truly what Hypotheſis, tho never ſo mean and full of Defects, would not ſupport it ſelf under all its flaws and imperfections, by ſuch a lawleſs liberty as this? A liberty of recourſe to *Extraordinary Providence*, and of bringing in *Miracles*, and the *Miniſtery* of Angels, to help to take off and ſolve thoſe Difficulties, which puzzle its Author, and baffle its Principles. To what purpoſe did he invent a Theory, and write a Treatiſe *with deſign* to ſhut out *one* Extraordinary Providence, the *creating of new Waters* to make the Deluge; when in this Treatiſe, and to uphold that Theory, he is conſtrain'd to let in *thus many?*

Diſc. p. 174.

Anſw. p. 30.

Eng. Theor. p. 2. *l.* 33,34.

But

But here the Answerer is plainly for *shifting*, to avoid a blow; which, for *that*, falls but the heavier upon him. The Theory, said the Excepter, will have the Rains to be *antecedent* to the Description of the Abyss: And he quoted these words, in proof of it. *I do not suppose the Abyss broken open till after the forty days rain. But then*, adds the Excepter, *this is most directly against Scripture; for that plainly affirms, that the Fountains of the great Deep, and the windows of Heaven were both open'd on* one day, *Gen.* 7. 11. Now to salve this repugnancy to Scripture, the Answerer here declares, that *he does not suppose the* Cataracts of Heaven *to have been open'd before, which made the* Grand *rains.* But then he must suppose that there were *two* forty-days-rains; one, *before* the Abyss was broke up, and another *beginning* with it, and *continuing* after it. But is not *this* also as much against Scripture, which owns but *one* forty-days rain, that commenc'd with the Disruption? And truly had the Vapours of the Atmosphære been exhausted (as they must have been) by the *first* continued forty-days rain (according to the Answerer's Supposition;) where could have been a supply for the *second* forty-days rain (especially when the Rains that fell then, were to be *grand rains*) without a *new Creation* of Waters, which the Theory *designedly* opposes? And then the LORD said unto *Noah*, *Gen.* 7. 4. *Yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the Earth forty days and forty nights.* And is it likely that GOD would have given that Preserver of the World notice, that Rains to make the Flood, should *begin* a Week *after*; if it had already rained for three and thirty days *before*, or for above a Month past?

Disc. p. 175.

Eng. Theor. p. 98.

Answ. p. 31.

Lastly, against the Equinox it was suggested, that Authors of all sorts have disputed, in *what Season* of the year the Flood came in, and the World had its beginning.

Disc. p. 176.

ning. Which hints that there was not any *one Seaſon* through all the Earth at once. But the Anſwerer intimates, that upon Suppoſition of an Equinox according to the Theory, it might be ſo. *And why*, ſays he, *may not that have given occaſion to the general belief*, that the World began in the Spring? Did he *inſiſt* upon *that Belief*, he muſt prove it to be *general*, and to be occaſion'd by the Equinox; and not take it for granted. But becauſe he ſays he does *not depend* upon it, we need not reply to it any farther neither.

Anſw. p. 31.

Ib.

In the next place the Excepter conſidered the *Authorities*, call'd in to eſtabliſh the Doctrine of the Equinox. That is, by proving that the Earth had ſuffered a *change* as to its Poſition, and thereby had loſt its former *Right Situation*. But theſe Authorities were not found *clear* enough to do the Theory's buſineſs; as will beſt appear to them that ſhall peruſe the Examination of the ſame.

Diſc. Ch. 8. § 7.

And here the Anſwerer is much offended, as if his Witneſſes were not fairly heard, but rather unjuſtly and illegally rejected, *becauſe they were unskilful in giving the Cauſes or Reaſons of a matter of fact*. We reply. All Teſtimonies muſt be taken as they are. And where evidence is not clear, for the ſame reaſon it is not certain, nor can it be valid. And when Witneſſes give it in, if they trip and faulter in any part of it; we have good reaſon to ſuſpect the whole. And as improbable Circumſtances in their Allegations, will invalidate them in matter of fact: ſo impoſſible ones, if mingled with them, will quite overthrow them. The true caſe of the Teſtimonies before us. They contain ſuch improbable and impoſſible things, as do not only weaken, but deſtroy them. Should twenty Mariners confidently affirm, that they ſailed in a Ship from *Dover* to *Calice*, by a brisk Gale out of a pair of Bellows: tho this be a matter of fact, muſt they not be reckoned notorious

Anſw. p. 32.

notorious Lyars? Or if forty Engineers ſhould poſitively ſwear, that the Powder-mill near *London*, was lately blown up, by a Mine then ſprung at Great *Waradin* in *Hungary*; muſt they not be grievouſly perjur'd Perſons? And the Philoſophers atteſting the Earth's Inclination, having charged their Evidence with as great Impoſſibilities; the Reports they make, muſt be as little credible. Or let us take the Inſtance which the Anſwerer gives, the *Peloponeſian* War. If the Hiſtorian that writes it, had told that the Souldiers who fell in it, fought only with *Sun-beams*, and *ſingle Currants* which grew thereabouts; and that hundreds and thouſands were ſtabb'd with the one, and knockt on the head with the other: who would believe that ever there were ſuch Weapons in that war; that ever there was ſuch a fatal War in that Country? Yet as poſſible it was for multitudes of men to be kill'd by theſe Inſtruments; as for the Poſition of the Earth to be chang'd by thoſe Cauſes, which were aſſign'd by the Theory's Philoſophic Witneſſes. For how could the Southern Pole of the Earth dip into the Air, through exceſs of heat, or exceſs of Fruits thereabouts; when at both Poles the heat of the Sun was equal, and ſo was the fatneſs and fertility of the Soil? (See *Diſc. p.* 180, 181.) Or if theſe were the Cauſes of that great Effect, why then was it not wrought ſooner, than at the end of above ſixteen hundred and fifty years? And yet theſe very Cauſes being not only brought into their Evidence, but made as true and expreſs a *part* thereof, as the Inclination of the Earth it ſelf; their Teſtimonies muſt extend to both alike: and in caſe the one be of doubtful credit, the other muſt be the ſame. Yea, the one, according to their Allegations, being *Cauſes*, and the other but an *effect* of them; if they be falſe witneſſes as to the *Cauſes* upon which the *Ibid.*

Effect,

Effect, according to their evidence, had its *whole* dependence; their *Teſtimonies*, as to the *Effect*, muſt needs fail and be nothing worth. For they plainly aſcribing it to cauſes that were not, and ſo could not produce it; at the ſame time, and by the ſame words that they atteſt there was ſuch an Effect; they witneſs withal that it could not be. And ſo their Evidence is as far from being valid and authentic; as contradiction is from truth.

Diſc. p. 179, 189, &c.

But what ill has the Excepter ſaid of *Anaxagoras*; that the Anſwerer taxes him not only with a *Groundleſs*, but alſo a **Rude** *Cenſure* of that famous man? Why, *he* aſſerted that an huge ſtone at the River *Ægos* in *Thracia* fell down from the Sun. And he being a Principal Witneſs of the change of the Earth's Poſition: the Excepter brings in this againſt him to weaken his evidence. Which it may well do upon this account; becauſe it beſpeaks him *a man as like to be Heterodox, as any of the Learned Ancients.* And this Cenſure is neither *Groundleſs*, nor *Rude*. Not *Groundleſs*. For as his Aſſertion was moſt wild, and childiſh, and ridiculous, and falſe; ſo it was as abſurd, unreaſonable, and extravagantly Heterodox as could readily be invented in Aſtronomy. Nor could he ſlip into this Error by chance, nor could he mean any thing elſe by the Aſſertion, than what he expreſſed; becauſe it agrees ſo well (as the Excepter obſerved) to the *ſtrain of his Philoſophy*, it being ſutable to his Hypotheſis of *generating Stars out of Stones*. Now that man (be he who, or what he will, even *Anaxagoras* himſelf) who is guilty of *one* ſo abominably groſs and ſhameful an Heterodoxneſs in Aſtronomy; is certainly as like to be guilty of *another, as any of the Learned*: and therefore the Cenſure cannot be *Groundleſs*. Nor is it *Rude*. For firſt, as we ſee, it is well grounded. Built (as

Anſw. p. 33.

Diſc. p. 184.

Ib.

(as the Excepter ſaid before) *upon a wretched foundation of his own laying.* He pull'd down the cenſure upon himſelf, by giving moſt juſt occaſion for it. Secondly, it was ſpoken of him as a *Witneſs* chiefly. As a Witneſs in *that Caſe* where the Excepter was concern'd. And *witneſſes*, we know, may be canvaſs'd and lookt into, as well as *what* they ſay. They may be ſifted, and explored, and ſpoken againſt too; if they give in falſe evidence, inſtead of true. Thirdly, it was ſpoken with this Caution, *not to diſparage* Anaxagoras, *but only to ſignify——that in any dark or doubtful opinion, we have no reaſon——to lay the ſtreſs of our belief upon his Authority, —— contrary to the whole World of the Learned.* Fourthly, *Pliny* paſs'd an *heavier* Cenſure upon him, which hitherto was never ſaid to be *rude*. For ſpeaking of *Anaxagoras*, and this ſtone which he phantſied fell out of the Sun: *Farewel the knowledge of Natures works*, ſays he, *and welcome confuſion of all, in caſe we ſhould believe it.* And how could he poſſibly reflect more *highly* upon an eminent Philoſopher, than to make him the Author of ſuch an Aſſertion, or to make him the Patron of ſuch an opinion; as if People had believ'd it, would have let confuſion into the World, by baniſhing natural Philoſophy out of it? Is not this a *more rugged* Cenſure, than ſaying *he was a man as like to be Heterodox, as any of the learned Ancients?* Yet who ever call'd it *Rude?*

Ib.

Ib. p. 185.

Nat. Hiſt. l. 2. *c.* 58.

But how extravagant ſoever *Pliny* thought him, the Anſwerer takes him to be very excuſable. And accordingly offers to make his excuſe *two* ways. Firſt, by ſaying, that *we are not to imagine, that all the opinions of the ancient Philoſophers, are truly conveyed to us.* And ſo the Earth's *Inclination* or its changed Poſition, which he conceives to be the Opinion of ſeveral Philoſophers; may be nothing but a falſity, or miſrepreſent-

Anſw. p. 34.

ted Notion of theirs. Secondly, by ſaying, that his Aſſertion *of a Stone that fell from the Sun*, cannot be *literally* true. And therefore like a witty Mythologiſt, he interprets it of the *Incruſtation of a fixt ſtar, and its deſcent into the lower World.* But did ever any ſtar come down ſo low, as to reſt upon the Earth? Or did ever any ſtar lie to be ſeen and wondred at by a Rivers ſide? Or could the ſmalleſt fixt ſtar be contained in *Thracia*? Or would it amount to no bigger bulk or burthen, than might be carry'd at one Waggon-load? Or can a Star intruſted with maculaes come out of the Sun? Yet all theſe Circumſtances (beſides the generating of Stars out of ſtones, which is capable of no very clever Mythological Expoſition) belong to *Anaxagoras*'s monſtrous Aſſertion, according to the acconnt that is given us of it. And if it be not *truly* his; and if it be not *literally* true: let the Anſwerer blame *Plutarch* and *Laertius* for making it ſo. But they *two* are the *very authors* out of whoſe Books he cites his Teſtimonies, for the Earth's changing of its Poſition. And we only bring in a *third* Perſon, telling the ſame ſtory (of this ſtony fiery fallen ſtar) for a *literal* truth; namely *Pliny*. And his Authority cannot but help much to confirm the thing, he being well known to be no trivial Writer.

Ib.

Plutar. Lyſand.

Pliny.

But does not the Anſwerer forget himſelf in this caſe? Is there not a greater than *Anaxagoras* here? What thinks he of *Moſes*? We might fill many Pages with his glorious Character, and yet come ſhort of his real worth. Let us only note that Encomium therefore which the H. GHOST beſtows upon him; where for his Excellency, he compares the very *Meſſiah* to him, *Act.* 3. 22. *A Prophet ſhall the* LORD *your* GOD *raiſe up unto you, like unto me.* That is, for Wiſdom, Miracles, &c. Now is not the Theoriſt more

more *rude* to this great and illuſtrious Prophet; than the Excepter was to the aforeſaid Philoſopher? The Excepter only noted *Anaxagoras*'s Doctrine, as delivered to the World by *unexceptionable Pens*; and made a *juſt* Obſervation upon it, *more mild*, or *leſs ſevere*, than a conſiderable Author (upon the ſame Paſſage) had made before him. But the Theoriſt confronted the inſpired Doctrine of *Moſes*; and that not only by implied, but alſo by explicit contradiction, in ſundry inſtances. For *Moſes* teaches, that *GOD made* **Two** *great Lights.* The Theoriſt argues that he made but *one*, by doubting of and diſputing againſt the Preſence of the Moon in the firſt World. *Moſes*, in his Coſmopœia, treats of *Light*, of *Stars*, of *the Soul of man*, and of the *Hoſt of the Heavens.* The Theoriſt averrs, that *the Subject of his Geneſis is the* **Chaos**, *and that moſt confus'd and* **earthly**; *and the things* **made out** *of this Chaos and related to it as a* **Center**. *Moſes* teaches, that *GOD gave* Adam *Dominion over the Fiſh of the Sea*, as He did, *over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the Earth.* The Theoriſt makes it one *Vital* or *Primary Aſſertion* of his Hypotheſis; that *the Primitive Earth was without Mountains, or a* **Sea**. *Moſes* aſſures us, that *Tubal Cain* was *an Inſtructer of every Artificer in Braſs and Iron.* The Theoriſt ſays, that in the *firſt Earth they had* no *Metals* nor *Minerals*, as he *believed.* Are not theſe plain Contradictions of *Moſes*? Yet the Replicant does not ſay that they were *Rude* ones. Tho whether they are not more *Rude* and *Groundleſs*, than the Excepter's *Cenſure* of *Anaxagoras* was; let the Ingenuous and Impartial, judge. And beſides, in his *Engliſh* Theory (p. 288.) he puts this amongſt the Vital Aſſertions of it. *That neither* Noah's *flood, nor the preſent Form of the Earth,* **can** *be explain'd in* **any other** *method that is* **rational,**

Gen. 1. 16. *Eng. Theor. p.* 241. *Gen.* 1. 3. *v.* 16. *Gen.* 2. 7. *v.* 1. *Subjectum autem Geneſeos* Moſaicæ, &c. Theor. Edit. 2. p. 234. *Eng. Theor. p.* 288. *Gen.* 4. 22. *Eng. Theor. p.* 244.

nor by **any other** *cauſes that are* **intelligible.** And ſpeaking of the Ancient Earth and Abyſs (p. 93.) he delivers himſelf thus. *If they were in no other Form, nor other ſtate than what they are under now, the* **expreſſions** *of the Sacred Writers concerning them are very* **ſtrange** and **inaccountable,** *without* **any ſufficient ground,** *or* **any juſt occaſion** *for ſuch* **uncouth repreſentations.** Some perhaps may ſee as much *rudeneſs* here, as in any thing that the Excepter ſaid of *Anaxagoras*. And ſhould abſolute ſtrangers to his Religion read this Author: they might poſſibly be apt to think, from many paſſages in his books, that inſtead of *believing* theſe ſacred Writers in ſeveral Matters; he deſigns to *confute* them. And ſhould they at the ſame time be ſtrangers to theſe Writers too, they might be apt to think alſo that they *deſerve* to be confuted, or that they were not *worth* confuting. For to ſay that their *repreſentations* of things are *uncouth*, and that their *Expreſſions* are *occaſionleſs* and *groundleſs*, and *very ſtrange*, and *inaccountable*; is the ſame thing as to ſay that they writ nonſenſe. Theſe are our Authors words: and if we will believe him (who muſt needs know beſt) he finds *no reaſon to alter his Opinion in any one particular.* And when he can thus expreſs himſelf of *ſacred Writers*, becauſe their Doctrines differ from his Notions: is he not like to be thought by ſome, to be as deep in the dirt of *rudeneſs*, as the Excepter is in the mire, for ſaying what he did of an heathen Author?

To the *Philoſophers*, the Anſwerer ſays, *he might have added the Teſtimonies of Poets*, who tell us of a *perpetual Spring*. And particularly he quotes *Ovid* for it. But if his Evidence muſt be admitted, it is but reaſon that we ſhould have the *whole* of it. And if we take it in its full latitude, there is nothing more *contrary* to the Aſſertions of the Theory, than that. For as *after*

ter that Teſtimony of his, *ver erat Æternum*, &c. *there was a perpetual Spring*; he ſays, *Anſw. p. 35.*

Flumina jam Lactis, jam flumina Nectaris ibant.

Sometimes Rivers flowed with Milk, *ſometimes with* Nectar: ſo *before* it, he ſpeaks *many* things, perfectly *deſtructive* to the Doctrine of the Theory. For he tells, that in the *Beginning*, and even *before* man was created; ſome Deity or other made *Seas*; ſuch Seas as had *Shores*, and were toſſed with *Winds*, and ſo were *open* Seas. *Metamor. l. 1. in initio.*

Tum Freta diffudit, rapidiſque tumeſcere ventis
Juſſit, & ambitæ circundare littora terræ.

Then *Seas* he made, with bluſtring *Storms* to ſwell;
And *Shores* to th' Earth inclos'd he gave as well.

Then he ſays there were *Valleys*, and *Stony Mountains.*

Juſſit & extendi campos, ſubſidere Valles,
Fronde tegi ſylvas, lapidoſos ſurgere montes.

Next Fields came forth, and *Valleys* ſunk below,
And leavy Trees, and ſtony Hills did grow.

And tells us farther, that at the ſame time, there were *two* Zones of the five, *covered with* **deep Snows.** And that there were not only *Miſts* but *Clouds*, and *dreadful Thunders*, and *cold Winds*, with *Lightnings.*

Nix tegit alta duas.——
Illic & nebulas, illic conſiſtere nubes
Juſſit, & humanas motura tonitrua mentes,
Et cum fulminibus facientes frigora ventos.

With pure white *Snows Two Zones* were covered,
There Miſts did fall, and *Clouds* were gathered;
And frightful *Thunders* dwelt that awe mens minds,
And flaſhing *Lightnings*, with moſt nipping *Winds.*

So that if he ſpake *one* word *for* the Theory, he ſpake **many** *againſt* it. And therefore it had been better that he had ſaid nothing; and that the Anſwerer had wav'd this Teſtimony of his.

In

Anſw. p. 36. In the next place he brings in *the Chriſtian Father's* Character *of Paradiſe*, in proof of his *perpetual prædiluvian Equinox*. And this *Character* he takes from *Bellarmine*, who delivers it in theſe words. *Paradiſus ita deſcribitur a Sancto* Baſilio, &c. *Paradiſe is ſo deſcrib'd by S.* Baſil, *in his Book of Paradiſe*; *by* John Damaſcen *in his ſecond Book of the* Faith, *and the eleventh Chapter*; *By* S. Auſtin *in the fourteenth book of the* City of GOD, *and the tenth Chapter*; *by* Alchimus Avitus, *and* Claudius Marius Victor, *and others above cited*; *by* Iſidore *in his fourteenth book of* Etymologys, *and third Chapter*; and others *commonly: as if in it there were a perpetual Spring, no colds, no heats, no rains, ſnows, hails, alſo no clouds; which very thing the Scripture ſignifies, when it ſays the firſt of mankind were naked in* Paradiſe. We reply. Firſt, that the *Cardinal* who here ſumms up the Evidence of theſe Witneſſes, as a Judge; did himſelf pronounce *Extravagant things* in the Caſe. And therefore no wonder if he picks up, and brings in ſuch kind of Teſtimonies, as may be ſomewhat ſutable to his own * Notions. Secondly, the Teſtimonies brought in by his own Pen, he blots out again with his own hand. For ſpeaking of *Bede's* opinion, *that Paradiſe was a place as high as the Moon*; (which he makes the opinion of *Bridefert* rather, who gloſſed upon *Bede*) he ſays, that the Author of that opinion, was pleaſed to make uſe of an *Hyperbole*; that by the *heighth* of that, *Paradiſi excellentiam demonſtraret, he might ſet forth the excellency of Paradiſe. Quemadmodum intelligimus verba Sancti* Baſilii, &c. *After the ſame manner that we underſtand the words of* S. Baſil---- *of* John Damaſcen, ——*of* Alchimus Avitus, &c. And when what they ſaid was *Hyperbolical*; to the Theory's purpoſe it cannot be material.

De Grat. prim. hom cap. 12.

* *He believed that the waters of the Flood came not into* Paradiſe; *But that* Enoch *was kept alive there when the Earth was drowned; and that he and* Elias *do dwell together there now, and ſhall continue to do ſo, till ſuch time as they come from thence to oppoſe* Antichriſt. *vid. Cap. 14. De* Grat. prim. hom.

De grat. prim. hom. Cap. 12.

Anſw. p. 37. After this he attaques the *two Queries* made by the Ex-

Excepter againſt the prædiluvian Equinox. The Firſt was this. *Would it (in likelihood) have continued till the Flood?* For the water of the Abyſs being in proceſs of time exhauſted, and the exterior Earth hanging hollow over an empty ſpace round it; by being *pendulous* and *oblong*, the waters upon that Earth abounding (for ſome reaſons given) more at one Pole of it, than at the other: might have ſunk or ſway'd down that Pole which was overcharged. To this the Anſwerer oppoſes; *the Waters were not more rarifi'd towards one Pole, than towards another.* And we never ſaid or thought they were. But in his *Engliſh Theory* we read (p. 229.) that the Current (of the waters from the Poles) might *in ſome places* **reſt** *and be* **ſtopt**; and then *it would ſpread it ſelf into* **Lakes**, *and riſe* till it grew to ſuch an heighth, as to be able by its force or weight, to *overflow and break looſe again*, before it could paſs farther. Now in caſe the Current might thue be ſtopt, and the obſtruction be ſo great as to cauſe the Waters to ſwell into *Lakes*; how eaſily might there be more or greater Lakes near to one of the Poles than the other? And ſo how eaſily would the *overweight* of water have ſunk the Earth down at the præponderating Pole, tho the Waters were no more *rarify'd* there than at the other? *That* therefore being wide of the Mark he ſhould have hit; he ſends another Arrow after it, taken out of the Quiver of Philoſophy. *The empty ſpace betwixt the exterior Region of the Earth, and the Abyſs below, would be fill'd with ſuch groſs vapors, that it would be little purer than water: and would ſtick to the Earth much cloſer than its Atmoſphære that is carried about with it.* But this ſhaft alſo, tho levell'd more directly at it, miſſes the intended Scope. For if thoſe Vapours were but a *little purer* than water, yet look how much they were ſo, and ſo much the weaker they would

Diſc. p. 185.

Diſc. p. 187.

P. 37.

Ib.

would be, and leſs able to keep the pendulous Earth in its Æquilibrious or even poſture. And that *groſſeſt* Vapours are *very much* purer or thinner than water, is evident from hence; that they cannot ſuſtain or buoy up a piece of light Cork; whereas upon waters, ſhips of greateſt Burthen float and ſwim. And tho the Atmoſphære be carried about with the Earth; yet if that were incloſed with an oblong or Oval Orb of Earth; this Orb would not ſit half ſo faſt and ſteddy upon that Sphære of Vapours, as it would do upon a Sphære of Waters: the Conſiſtency of Water being many times as thick again, as any Maſs of Vapours can be, in their natural Conſtitution.

Diſc. p. 187. The Second Query is this. Granting there was ſuch an Equinox in the firſt World, *Would not the natural day, towards the latter end of that World, have been longer, than in the former periods of the ſame?* Yet that the days juſt before the Flood were of no unuſual length, is evident in the very Story of the Flood; the Duration of which we find computed by Months conſiſting of Thirty days apiece. Whereas, ſays the Excepter, had Days been grown *longer, fewer* of them would have made a Month. *This*, ſays the Anſwerer, *is a meer Blunder*. And he proves it thus. *If thirty days were to go to a Month, whether the days were longer or ſhorter, there muſt be thirty of them; and the Scripture does not determine the length of the days.* *Anſw. p.* 28. Tho Scripture does not limit or account for the length of days expreſly, yet it does it implicitly, and withal very plainly and intelligibly. For it gives us to underſtand, that days before the flood, were of the ſame length that they are of now; by informing us that months and years which were of the ſame length then, that they are of at preſent, were made up of the ſame numbers of days. For how could there be juſt *twelve* Months

Months in the Year, at the time of the Deluge, and *thirty* days in each of thoſe Months; if days then had not conſiſted, as they do now, of four and twenty hours apiece? And as Providence has ſo ordered Nature, that days (which depend upon its *Diurnal* motion) ſhould be meaſured by Circumgyrations of the Earth: So it has order'd likewiſe that Months (which depend upon its Annual Motion) ſhould be meaſured by its progreſs in the Heavens. And as it has ſo ſuted theſe Motions, that the Earth, while it makes a Month, by running from one *Sign* in the *Zodiack* to another; ſhould turn about thirty times upon its own Axis, and thereby make ſo many Days: So it has taken care, that each of theſe Circumrotations ſhould be perform'd in four and twenty hours, and conſequently that every day ſhould be juſt ſo long; that thirty of them (in way of round reckoning) might compleat a Month. But now had the Circumgyrations of the Earth grown more *ſlow* towards the Deluge (by ſuch cauſes as the Excepter ſuggeſted) ſo that every day had conſiſted of *thirty* hours, ſuppoſe: it is manifeſt that *fewer* than thirty days (they being *longer* than formerly) muſt have made a Month. Becauſe then before the Earth could have turned round thirty times; ſhe would have been tranſlated, by her progreſſive motion, from one Celeſtial Conſtellation to another; and ſo the Month would have been conſummated. But to talk, as the Anſwerer does, that the Month ſhould be lengthened by the days being ſo; is a fearful *Blunder* indeed. Tho as luck will have it ſtill, it falls upon himſelf. For let the days (by ſlackning of the Earth's Diurnal motion) have been never ſo long; yet (its Annual motion continuing the ſame) the *Month* muſt needs have kept its *uſual* Length; only *fewer* days would have made it up; the very thing objected.

The Anſwerer therefore need not have been ſo officious, as to undertake to teach the Excepter to ſpeak: which he was pleaſed to do in theſe Words. *I ſuppoſe that which he would have ſaid, and which he had confuſedly in his mind, was this; That the* Month *would have been longer at the Flood, than it was before.* The Anſwerer it ſeems, had ſuch a *confuſed* thought in his mind; but the Excepter ('tis plain) was clear from it. And truly had he been guilty of it, he ſhould have counted it a *Meer Blunder.* For how could the *Month* be *longer*, for the *Earth's* Circumgyrations being *ſlower*; when the Month was meaſured by ſuch a motion of the Earth, as would have continu'd as ſwift as ever, tho its Circumgyrations had been never ſo ſlack? The Moon never turns circularly upon her own Center, to make days and nights; and yet ſhe makes regular Months and Years by her Periodical and Synodical Courſes. And had the Circumgyrations of the Earth been never ſo ſwift at the Deluge, or had they been never ſo ſlow, or had they been none at all; ſtill the Months would have been the ſame that they were; and neither longer nor ſhorter. Tho then indeed they could not have conſiſted of ſo many *days* and *nights*, following each other in an orderly ſucceſſion; becauſe through want of the Earth's Diurnal motion, there would have been no ſuch viciſſitude of them.

Anſw. p. 30.

And ſince the Anſwerer took upon him to tell the Excepter what he had in his mind, as he ſuppoſed: the Replicant, in requital of his kindneſs, as well as in imitation of his Patern; may ſuggeſt to him what *he* ſhould have had in his thoughts. When he ſaid, *if thirty days were to go to a Month, whether the days were longer or ſhorter, there muſt be thirty of them*: he ſhould have conſidered, that theſe thirty days were to be of ſuch a length juſt, as that that Number of them might make

make a Solar Month. For ſuppoſing them either longer or ſhorter than ſo, they could not be ſuch days as the Scripture ſpeaks of; becauſe thirty of *them* ſtill made ſuch a Month. Whereas if they had been ſhorter, as there muſt have been more; ſo if they had been Longer, fewer would have done it. And thus the Anſwerer's deſign of throwing a *Blunder* upon the Excepter, is quite defeated: and while he made an awkward Blow at *him*, he only ſtruck and wounded himſelf.

Yet the Duſt he here raiſes, can neither hide the Objection which the Excepter made; nor yet ſo blind the Reader's eyes, as that he ſhould not ſee it remains unanſwered. For after all, if the Contiguity of the Sphære of the Exterior Earth with the Abyſs, ceaſed; by reaſon the Waters of the Abyſs were exhaled: that Sphære of the Earth muſt be carried about with leſs Celerity than before it was. Eſpecially if the Moon came late into the Earth's Neighbourhood; which being an heavy Luggage in the outward part of the Earth's Vortex; like a Clog hang'd upon the Rim of a Wheel, would make it turn more ſlowly, as the Excepter objected.

But becauſe we have hinted, that Scripture gives us to underſtand, that there were twelve Months in the Antediluvian year, and thirty days in each of thoſe Months; it will not be amiſs to conclude this Chapter, with ſhowing how Scripture makes the things out. In the eighth of *Geneſis* then, and the fifth verſe, it informs us, that *the waters decreaſed until the tenth Month.* And after this, that *at the end of forty days* Noah *opened the window of the ark, v. 6th.* And that *he ſtayed yet other ſeven days, and ſent forth the Dove, v. 10th.* And that *he ſtayed yet other ſeven days, and ſent forth the Dove* again, *v. 12th.* Which *fifty four*

days following the *firſt* day of the tenth Month, on which the tops of the Mountains were ſeen, *v.* 5th. ſhow that there muſt be *twelve* months in the year; and indeed they make them up ſo many, bating *five* days, which we muſt ſuppoſe were ſtill to run out, before the firſt Month of the next year came in, *v.* 13*th.* And then it ſhows that there were *thirty days* in each Month. For firſt we find *twenty ſeven* days in one Month in this Chapter, *v.* 14*th.* And as we read in the Seventh Chapter, *the Waters prevailed upon the Earth one hundred and fifty days, v.* 24*th.* Yet they began to come in, *the ſeventeenth day of the ſecond month*, v. 11*th.* and they began to decreaſe by *the ſeventeenth day of the ſeventh month.* Chap. 8*th. v.* 3*d.* Whence it is plain that the hundred and fifty days made juſt five months, during which the Waters prevailed; and ſo every month muſt conſiſt of *thirty* days.

CHAP. IX.

IN the beginning of this Chapter, relating to *the Oval Figure of the firſt Earth*; he goes about to *rectify* a Principle of the Excepter's: That *terreſtrial Bodies have a nitency inwards or downwards towards their Central point.* But let this be underſtood of *Self-centred* and *Quieſcent* Earthly Bodies; and the Aſſertion will need no Rectification. And ſo the Excepter really meant it ſhould be underſtood. For he was not yet come to Conſider the Maſs upon which the Primitive Earth was founded, as turning upon its own Center; but was going on towards the Conſideration.

Anſw. p. 38.

See *Diſc. p.* 190.

The Waters of that Maſs (Globular at firſt) riſing up above the Æquator, by its gyration upon its own Axis: became oval (and ſo made the Earth of that Figure)

gure) *defluendo ad latera, by flowing down at the ſides* of the Globe. So the Theoriſt ſaid at firſt. To this word the Excepter ſpake ſo home, that the Anſwerer, we ſee, was almoſt angry, by the Reflections he makes. We will therefore touch that tender place no more, for fear of giving farther Provocation. And we the rather forbear to preſs upon it, becauſe the Anſwerer, we find, is ſenſible it is ſore, by the Plaiſter he is fain to apply to it. For now he has explain'd *that* word by *another*, as he tells us; namely, *Detruſione*. Let us therefore to the *Thing*. Only in our paſſage to it, it will not be amiſs to obſerve his humour. When he was fain to flinch, and forc'd thus to ſhift from one word to another; he falls upon the Excepter with a cauſeleſs cenſure of *Pedantry* and *little triumphs*. He reſolves, that is, to ſhoot Powder, where he wants Bullets: and at the ſame time that he gives Ground, he will be as fierce as if he gain'd it. Very pleaſant to ſee to! that he who blamed ſtrong Paſſions as producing weak Arguments; ſhould thus, by his Anger, ſhow his Impotence. But we are to conſider the Thing.

Diſc. p. 193, 194. Anſw. p. 39.

Ib.

And here the Anſwerer interrogates; *May not waters aſcend by force and detruſion; when it is the eaſieſt way they can take to free themſelves from that force, and perſevere in their motion?* Without all Queſtion they may: provided *that* force and detruſion be of power ſufficient to compel them to aſcend, againſt the Principle of their natural Gravity, and ſuch extrinſic accidental Obſtacles, as may chance to lye in their way and hinder them. But what then? He goes on: *This is the caſe we are ſpeaking to. They were impell'd to aſcend, or recede from the Center, and it was eaſier for them to aſcend laterally, than to aſcend directly: upon an inclin'd Plain, than upon a perpendicular one.* This aſſertion wants a great deal of Proof. For that the Waters of the Chaos, ſhould,

Ib.

ſhould, through the Circumgyration of it, riſe or aſcend any way, is very improbable: as being bound down by the circumambient Air, which is carried about therewith. Fill a ſphærical Glaſs with water, and then turn it ſwiftly upon its own Center. However the water in this Glaſs, may have a ſtrong and conſtant *Conatus* (during that its Motion) towards riſing up: yet certain it is, the Glaſs that contains it, would keep it from ſwelling out beyond thoſe Bounds to which it ſelf confines it. In like manner, the Body of the Air (in which at that time, was the whole matter of the Exterior Earth diffuſed) ſurrounding the entire Element of the Water; would have kept *that* from *actual* receding from the Center; tho it were impregnated with a *conatus* that way. 'Tis confeſs'd, if we take a Globe and turn it round ſwiftly; Water, or Sand, if we lay either upon it, will fly off it violently. And one reaſon is, becauſe the ambient Air does not turn with this Globe: but gliding cloſe upon its wheeling Surface, by a renitency againſt it, ſweeps off whatever lies looſe upon it. But were the Air about it, carried round with it; the lighteſt things, that lye looſeſt on its Superficies, would reſt there unmoved; ſuppoſing it the proper Center of their Gravity. And for the ſame reaſon, fineſt Duſt lies undiſturb'd, even upon the tops of higheſt Mountains; tho they whisk about with ſuch celerity, as no humane Art and ſtrength can imitate. And if the Earth's Rotation, as rapid as it is, cannot cauſe ſmall Duſt to riſe from Hills, in way of receſſion from the Center: much leſs could it produce that great effect upon the Maſs of Water; which as it was a vaſt and ponderous Body, ſo it couched the cloſer to the Earth under it.

And the truth is, as to a competent or ſufficient Cauſe of the Water's ſuppoſed *Riſe* or *Aſcent*; we are yet at a loſs. For the Cauſe aſſigned, is *Detruſion*; Detruſion

truſion made by the *ſuperambient Air. Methinks the Obſervator might have conceiv'd this Detruſion of waters towards the Poles, by the reſiſtance of the ſuperambient Air.* But now if this Cauſe fail'd, and was not able to detrude the Waters at the *Equinoctial*, where they were to be thruſt down: Or, which is worſe, if it be found a more effectual Cauſe to detrude them at the *Poles*, where they were to riſe up: what then becomes of this *Aſſertion* we are upon: or of that *Eſſential* of the Theory it relates to; the *Oval form* of the Primitive Earth? Yet in Reality thus it was. The Air that ſhould have depreſs'd or thruſt down the Waters, at the *Æquator* of the liquid Globe; was *more diſpos'd* to do it at its *Polar* parts. For the Sun moving always in the Equinoctial of that Globe; the Air thereabouts muſt needs be very hot; and ſo, very thin; and ſo, very yielding; and ſo, leſs able to reſiſt and detrude the Waters. And on the contrary, the Sun being always very diſtant from the Poles; the Air in thoſe parts muſt needs be more cold: and ſo, more thick, and ſo, more ſtiff and heavy; and ſo, more fit to make Reſiſtance and Detruſion there, than any where elſe. Yet ſee the unluckineſs of this contrivance: the Waters were to riſe higher there, much higher at the Poles, where the Air would moſt reſiſt them; and to be thruſt down loweſt at the Æquator, by the Air, where it could leaſt depreſs them. And if by the Air's *Reſiſtance*, be meant any thing elſe, but a *meer Detruſion* ariſing from its *natural weight* (which, as is ſaid, had moſt force to keep the Waters down, where it was moſt needful they ſhould have riſen up) *ſuch* a Reſiſtance cannot be conceived; conſidering that the whole Maſs of the Air was carried about in Circumgyration with the Globe of Water. The Deſerts of *Biledulgerid*, *Lybia*, &c. lie betwixt the

Anſw. p. 39.

the Æquator and our Northern Tropic; and ſo within the compaſs of that Latitude, where the Waters of the liquid Globe, ſhould have felt a Reſiſtance of the Air. But what reaſon have we to believe they did ſo, when the light or running Sands there, are no more ruffled, or in the leaſt ſtirred by ſuch Reſiſtance; than if they were a cruſt of Flint or Adamant? and the like may by ſaid of *Mare del Zur*. It lies under the Line, and ſo in the Equinoctial part of this Terraqueous Globe. Which being there of the biggeſt Circumference, it muſt turn thereabouts moſt ſwiftly, and ſo cauſe the greater reſiſtance of the Air (were there any ſuch thing) and that would produce as great a diſturbance in the Water. But on the contrary, ſo quiet, and ſtill, and ſmooth, and even, is this vaſt Ocean; that it is called the *Pacific Sea*. And if theſe ſpatious Waters, ſo exactly fitted for this Reſiſtance, both by their ſituation, and immenſely wide and far extended Surface; feel nothing of it now, why *ſhould* or how *could* the waters of the Abyſs do it at firſt? No, the Air reſiſted and detruded *then*, but as it does *now*: That is, ſo far as its own Gravity cauſed a Compreſſion. Which as it was gentle, ſo it was general; compaſſing the entire Globe at once with a ſoft conſtringency. Only there was reaſon (as we have ſhewed) why this compreſſion ſhould be lighteſt at the Equinoctial, and why it ſhould be heavieſt at the Poles of the Globe; and why it could not make ſuch *Reſiſtance*, or *Detruſion*, as is imputed to the Air. In ſhort. If it did make *Reſiſtance*; either it was gentle, and would only have rimpled the Surface of the turning Waters (as the *Subſolanus* does, which blows conſtantly about the Equator) and ſo would not have been of force ſufficient to depreſs them into an oval Figure: or elſe it was violent; and ſo would have diſcompos'd the Abyſs ſo much, that

that the Earth could never have been founded upon it. And truly what leſs than ſuch a violence as would ſo have diſcompos'd it, could alter the Figure of it?

But yet that there neither was, nor could be ſuch a violent reſiſtance made by the Air, as to detrude the Waters of the Chaotic Maſs; may, I think be demonſtrated from the Motion of the Moon. Her Diſtance from hence in her Perigee, or neareſt approach to us, is about 51 Semidiameters of the Earth: in her Apogee, or fartheſt remove from us, about 65. To take a moderate or middling Diſtance therefore betwixt both, let us ſuppoſe her always 56 of thoſe Semidiameters off us. And then let us ſuppoſe again, that ſhe performs her Periodical Circuit in 28 Days; tho ſhe does it in leſs. Now ſhe abſolving her Circuit at 56 Semidiameters diſtance from the Earth, in 28 Days; in caſe She were but 28 Semidiameters diſtant, which is but half the Space; ſhe muſt do it in 14 Days, which is but half the time. And ſo were ſhe diſtant but 14 Semidiameters; ſhe muſt do it conſequently in 7 Days. According to which proportion, the Air towards the Earth, at the heighth of one Semidiameter above it, muſt wheel about as faſt as the Earth it ſelf does, to the ſpace of half a Day. Now every Semidiameter of the Earth containing, ſays Mr. *Rohault* (*Tract. Phyſ. par.* 2. *cap.* 12.) near 1431 Leagues; or 4293 *Engliſh* Miles: hence it will follow, that the Air at the heighth of 2146 Miles, turns about as faſt as the Earth, bating but 6 Hours. And at the heighth of 1073 Miles, as faſt as that, bating 3 Hours. And ſo at the heighth of 357 Miles (to avoid fractions) to one Hour. Which divide into 60 parts, becauſe in an Hour there are 60 Minutes; and the Air at the heighth of 6 Miles, muſt turn as faſt as the Earth (in round reckoning) to the ſpace of one Minute. And (if we drive down the Ac-

count ſo low) at 3 quarters of a Miles heighth, it muſt turn as faſt, to the eighth part of a Minute. And ſo juſt on its Surface, *even* with it. And when the Air encompaſſing the Earth, does thus conſpire and circulate with it in its Gyration; how could it poſſibly reſiſt the Waters of the turning Abyſs, ſo as to change their figure, from Sphærical, to Oval?

Nor will the Anſwerer's *Simile* help here, unleſs it be to aggravate the thing againſt himſelf. He thinks this Detruſion of the Waters may be conceived, *as well as their flowing towards and upon the Shores, by the preſſure of the Air under the Moon.* And ſo indeed it may, by thoſe that can conceive the Air alone to be as heavy in it ſelf; as that and the Moon are both together. But who in reaſon can conceive this?

Anſw. p. 39.

And to ſay it was *eaſier* for waters to aſcend *laterally*, than *directly*; to aſcend upon an *inclin'd* Plain, than a *perpendicular* one: is vain in this caſe. For what real *Inclination* could there be on a Globe, towards the Poles, more than at the Equator; every point of whoſe Superficies is Equidiſtant from the Center? And how could the Aſcent of Waters at the Poles of a Globe, be other than Direct and perpendicular; when its Polar parts are always as much a Plain, as its Æquinoctial ones can poſſibly be? So that to ſuppoſe waters could aſcend more eaſily at the Poles, than at the Æquator of the Chaotic Abyſs; is in effect to ſuppoſe, that they could aſcend perpendicularly more eaſily than they could aſcend perpendicularly. For at the Poles they were to aſcend as directly as at the Æquinoctial; (the waters being exactly *globular* at firſt, till by this ſuppoſed aſcent they grew *oval.*) Only there they muſt have met with theſe two Diſadvantages, which at the Equinoctial they were free from. Firſt, (as we have hinted already) a more cold, and thick and

and ſtark Air. Which we may be ſure would crowd them down at the Poles; becauſe an Air more warm, and fine, and ſoft, and open, is preſum'd to do it at the *Æ*quator. Secondly, a weaker Spring or power to impel them. For in the Middle of the turning Globe, there was a *Conatus* or tendency of the Waters towards receding from the Center; but at the Sides of it, none at all. So that at the ſides they were to riſe, by that *Conatus* or Nitency in the Middle. And if a thin and open Air could prevail againſt that force, in its direct and primary efforts at the Æquinoctial; how much more would a thicker, cloſer Air have overpowred it, where it could be exerted but obliquely, remotely, and as it were at ſecond hand: at the Poles of the Abyſs?

From what has been ſaid, it will follow; that without a better Defence of this *Vital Aſſertion* of the Theory, its whole Hypotheſis will fall to the Ground, for want of an *Oval* Earth to ſupport it. And whereas the Anſwerer in the Cloſe of his 14th. Chapter, makes this Reflection. *Some men, they ſay, though of no great valour, yet will fight excellently well behind a Wall: So the Excepter, behind a Text of Scripture, is very fierce and rugged:* He may pleaſe to take notice, that (tho it be much better fighting *behind* the Wall of a Text, than *againſt* it) the Excepter is here behind no ſuch Wall: but ingages him in the open field of Reaſon and Philoſophy, and doubts not but to keep his Poſt. That is, if he does not run to his *Firſt Expedient* (as his wont is) and turn the great Artillery of *Extraordinary Providence* upon him, before which there is no ſtanding. For that mows down the beſt Arguments, and makes a Lane through them; as Chain-ſhot does through a Company of the braveſt Souldiers, tho they fight never ſo well, and have all imaginable

Right on their ſide. But then he muſt deſert his Hypotheſis again (as he has often done;) and the World knows what he is that runs from his Colours: One, *they ſay, of no great Valour.* But truly if it be matter of reproach to a man, to fight *behind a Text of Scripture*; the Excepter deſires that it may always ſtick cloſe to him. To adhere to the divine and holy Word, and to oppoſe error by revealed truth; he thinks is far enough from Cowardiſe. Bleſſed be GOD that we have ſuch a wall as His Scripture is, behind which, to fight againſt Truth's Enemies.

Yet in this very Inſtance of forming an Oval Earth, he flies to the help of *Extraordinary Providence*, and thereby turns this neceſſary and indiſpenſable Notion of the *Air's* reſiſtance or *detruſion*, quite out of doors. I mean by a certain Dilemma of his own, brought in in the ſecond Page of his Anſwer. I apply it to him in his own words. *Either you take the Hypotheſis of an ordinary Providence, or of an extraordinary, as to the time allowed for the Formation of the Earth. If you proceed according to an* ordinary *Providence, the formation of the Earth would require* much more time than ſix days. And ſo you muſt not take that Hypotheſis, becauſe as you your ſelf own, in the fifth page of your Anſwer, *Scripture tell us* that the Earth *was form'd the third day. But if according to an* extraordinary, *you may ſuppoſe it made in ſix minutes.* But then the *Reſiſtance* or *Detruſion* of the Air, could not make the Waters *oval*, that the Earth might be ſo. For *that* being an *ordinary, natural* Cauſe (ſuppoſing it could be a cauſe) would have required *much more time than ſix days*, for the production of ſuch an Effect. And conſequently this *Reſiſtance*, or *Detruſion*, is made vain here and utterly uſeleſs by your ſelf.

But if againſt the Anſwerer's conceſſion of an extraordinary

ordinary or miraculous efficiency here, we ſhould ſuppoſe an oval Earth to be made in a *natural* way; and that in order thereunto a globular Abyſs were to be form'd into an oval figure: yet how could this be done according to the rule or method of the Theory? For if the Waters of the Chaos, by receding from the Center, did riſe up at the Equinoctial part of it, and above fall off towards the Poles: then underneath there muſt be a draught of Waters back again from the Poles toward the Equinoctial; which continuing to riſe there, might puſh or drive on the ſtream towards the Poles, that otherwiſe would not hold on its motion; foraſmuch as it flowed on a true Globe, the ſurface of which is equivalent to a Plain, where Waters never flow but by force or impulſe. And yet if ſuch counter-motions as theſe be allowed to thoſe Waters, they might thus flow and reflow for ever, without producing the deſign'd effect. For the draught of Waters below towards the Equinoctial, would draw in the liquid Maſs at the Poles, and ſo hinder its growing into an oblong or oval figure; as much as the Driſt of them above towards the Poles could ſwell them out there, and ſo help towards the ſame.

The firſt Argument againſt the Oval Figure of the Earth, was its inconvenient *Poſition*, which would have followed thereupon. For then it muſt have lain *croſs* the vehicular Stream, by which it was carried round the Sun; and have been directed not unlike to Ships ſailing ſide-ways: and ſo it could not have kept that Poſition long, but muſt have chang'd its Site in compliance with the duct or tendency of that Current wherein it ſwam. In anſwer to this it is ſuggeſted; that ſuch a poſture as lying *croſs the Stream*, would *be more likely to effect* the Earth's turning upon its own axis, as it does. *And the Stream would take more hold*

of

of an oblong Body, than of a round. (*Anſw. p.* 40.) And becauſe it would *take more hold* of it, for that very reaſon it would the ſooner turn it out of its Poſition. For what makes the force of a ſtream, turn a long Body that lies croſs it; ſooner than another as long, which already lies length-ways in it; but only its taking more hold of it? And then as to the Earth's *turning upon its own axis*, it would rather have promoted than prevented the change of its ſituation; conſidering its *wallowings* in its Annual Circuit. For where a Body has two Motions upon the ſame Center, if one of them chances to be irregular; the other commonly diſorders it farther, rather than helps to correct its Exorbitance. Somewhat like a Bowl, which being not ſet out of hand right; the oftner it turns round in its progreſſive motion, the farther it runs on in a wrong Courſe.

Diſc. p. 196. The ſecond Argument againſt the Oval Figure of the firſt Earth, is the *Sphæricalneſs* of the preſent Earth. And that the preſent Earth is Sphærical, is not only the Opinion of Modern, but alſo of Ancient Philoſophers, ſaid the Excepter; and he named ſome. But *Anſw. p.* 40. *the Theoriſt*, ſays the Anſwerer, *alledg'd* **many more** *Authorities in favour of the Oval Figure of the Earth. For beſides* Empedocles *in particular*, he affirms *that the Philoſophy of* Orpheus, *the* Phœnician, Ægyptian, *and* Perſian *Philoſophers, did all compare the Earth to an Egg, with reſpect to its Oval External Form.* Here we

Another untruth. muſt reply, 1ſt, That this is another very *falſe Aſſertion.* For thoſe Philoſophers made the compariſon betwixt the *World* and the Egg, not betwixt the *Earth* and the Egg (tho our Author would put that ſenſe upon them.)

Lat. Theor. Edit. 2. *p.* 267. Only two of the Authorities cited by him, reſemble the Earth to the *Yolk* of the Egg very unluckily; for *that*, we know, is of a *round* Figure. 2ly, Where the Ancients compare the World to an Egg, they do it uſually

uſually with reſpect to its *Production*, as well as to its *Form*. A Notion which the Anſwerer, or any Theiſt, would be loth to admit of; that Heaven, and Earth, and all things therein, ſhould ſpring out of a material Egg. A pregnant Inſtance of this, occurs in *Athenagoras* (which upon occaſion we noted formerly) who tells us, that *Orpheus* (the Author, we may ſuppoſe, of the Doctrine of the *Mundane Egg*; for *Plutarch* calls it. Ὀρφικὸν λόγον, *the* Orphic *Doctrine*) taught; that *a vaſt Egg brought forth by* Hercules, *being broke by him, fell into two parts. Of the upper part, Heaven was made; and of the lower, the Earth.* (So that *Heaven* was contained in, and ſprung out of this Egg, as well as the *Earth.*) And then, Οὐρανὸς Γῆ μιχθεὶς, *&c. Heaven being mingled with Earth, brought forth Men, Women, and* GODS. And what is this leſs (tho the Gentil Divinity was tinctur'd with it) than a piece of rankeſt Atheiſtic Phyſiology? For it makes Mankind and Gods, to riſe out of meer Matter, without allowing ſuch a Principle as Soul or Spirit to any one of them. And this Egg, out of which *Ariſtophanes* will have γένος ἀθανάτων, *the Race of Gods* to be hatched, as well as mortal and inanimate Creatures; was layed, he ſays, by *Chaos* and *Night*. And ſo gives us a plain account of the old Atheiſtic Theology; which made Θεογονία, and Κοσμογονία, the Production of the Gods, and the Production of the World, the ſame thing. Yet the Theoriſt was pleaſed to ſhow, that between *this* Doctrine, and *his*, there is an Harmony or Affinity. Which if it will conciliate Reputation to his Hypotheſis, let it. But ſo far as it agrees with the *Ariſtophanic* or Atheiſtic Coſmogony; ſo far it will be the leſs reconcilable to the *Moſaic* Coſmology, or inſpired Doctrine of the Creation.

Legat. pro Chriſt. pa. (mihi) 72. *Diſc. p.* 105. *Sympoſ.* l. 2. Qu. 3.

In Avib.

Vid. *Lat. Theor.* li. 2. c. 7. & 10. *Edit.* 2.

The

Diſc. p. 197. Anſw. p. 41.

The *Sphæricalneſs* of this preſent Earth was argued; Firſt, from the *Conical* Figure of its ſhadow caſt upon the Moon. *But that*, ſays the Anſwerer, *cannot make a Difference, ſenſible to us at this diſtance, whether the Body that caſt the ſhadow was exactly Sphærical or Oval.* This is *gratis dictum*, and ſpoken againſt a common and approved Argument; and ſo of little weight.

Secondly, It was inferred from the place of the Waters. Which are deepeſt, ſo far as we know, near the Poles: whereas were the Earth Oval, the middle Regions thereof being loweſt, the Waters would have run thither, and ſettled under the Æquator. *But this*, he tells us, *has been anſwer'd before. The ſame Cauſe that drive the Waters thither, would have kept them there.* And that Anſwer has been reply'd to already: and the Replicant has ſhewed, that there was no ſufficient Cauſe to *drive* the Waters thither; and ſo none to *keep* them there.

Thirdly, It was urged, That if this Earth was Oval, Navigation towards the Poles would be extremely difficult, if not impoſſible, becauſe of Sailing up an Aſcent. *But*, ſays the Anſwerer, *If there be a continual draught of Waters from the Æquator towards the Poles, this will Ballance the Difficulty.* But if there be *no ſuch draught*, the difficulty holds: and that there is ſuch a Draught, remains to be proved.

That the Figure of this Earth is truly Sphærical, is fairly diſcovered and determin'd by this Obſervation. That the Gibboſity of the Sea riſes as faſt behind a Ship Sailing in direct *Latitude*, towards the Poles: as behind one whoſe courſe lies in direct *Longitude*, towards Eaſt or Weſt.

CAP.

CHAP. X.

THE Excepter proved that Mountains were before the Flood, from the words of *Moſes*, *Pſal.* 90. *Before the Mountains were brought forth*——*Thou art GOD from everlaſting.* And from *Pro.* 8. 22, 25. where we read, that *the LORD poſſeſſed* WISDOM,——*before the Mountains were ſettled.* And the Anſwerer grants, that *the deſign and intention of the H. GHOST is plain in both theſe places: in the one, to ſet out the Eternity of GOD; and in the other, of the* Logos *in particular.* Now where it was the *deſign* and *intention* of the H. GHOST, to ſet out the Exiſtence of GOD and the Divine *Logos*, which were from everlaſting, by temporal things; would he do it by any but ſuch as were *ſooneſt* brought into being? Or would *Moſes* himſelf, without the H. GHOST, have done it by any other things than ſuch? Surely it would have been a very faint and improper Illuſtration of GOD's Eternity (unbecoming *Moſes*, much more the H. SPIRIT) to ſay that he exiſted before the World was *ſeventeen hundred years old.* Yet when he ſaid He was *before the Mountains*, what did he ſay leſs, if the Mountains were made in the time of the Flood: the World having ſtood above fixteen hundred and fifty years, before that came in?

Read *Diſc.* c. 10. § 1.

Anſw. p. 43.

And whereas the Anſwerer ſuggeſts, that the *Pſalmiſt*'s words might have *a gradation* in them *from a lower Epocha to an higher*; when he ſaid, *before the Mountains were brought forth, and the Earth and the World were made*: Let him ſhow when, and where, any ſuch gradation was ever made uſe of, by an inſpired Writer, to ſet out the Eternity of the EVERLASTING GOD. And whereas he adds, *as for that place in* Prov. 8. *it*

Ib.

would be very hard *to reduce all thoſe things that are mentioned there,* (*from* ver. 22. *to the* 30) *to the ſame time of exiſtence:* Let him ſhow, if he pleaſes, why the things there mention'd, called GOD's *Works of* old, may not *very eaſily* be reduced (as to their firſt exiſtence) within the time of the ſix days of Creation.

Diſc. p. 202. *Moſes* (the Excepter added) mentions *laſting* hills, and *ancient* Mountains, *Deut.* 33. 15. But he would hardly have call'd them ſo had they riſen at the Flood, becauſe then they would have been but few ages older than himſelf; that is about ſeven hundred years. To this it is anſwered; *the River* Kiſhon *is call'd the* ancient

Anſw. p. 43. *River; but I do not therefore think it neceſſary, that that brook ſhould have been before the flood.* Nor does he think it neceſſary that ſeveral *other things* ſhould have been before the Flood. Yea, his Hypotheſis makes it neceſſary that they ſhould not then be. But does it follow ever the more from hence that they were not? He goes on.

Ib. *Things may very well deſerve that Character of* laſting, *or* ancient, *tho they be of leſs antiquity than the Deluge*; as *laſting Pyramids*, and *ancient Babylon.* But were the Mountains, ſuppoſing them made at the Flood, as laſting and ancient in *Moſes*'s time; as the *Pyramids* and *Babylon* are *now*?

Diſc. p. 205. The next Argument was drawn from the Mountains in the Moon. They, as we are told, are better than *four* times as high as the Mountains of the Earth. And therefore they ſeem to be her *native* Features, rather than Effects of her Diſſolution. For had they been raiſed by her being diſſolved, they could not have been ſo ſtrangely over-proportion'd to the Mountains of the Earth, ſhe being a much leſs Planet than that. And in caſe the Moon had Mountains from the beginning, why might not the Earth have ſo too?

Anſw. p. 44. *Tis eaſy to ſee*, the Anſwerer ſays, *that this is no*

good

good Argument. For beſides that the Orb there might be more thick, all ruines do not fall alike. And 'tis as eaſy to ſee that this is *no good Anſwer.* For the Moon being more than forty times leſs than the Earth; the Chaos out of which She was formed at firſt, muſt be more than forty times leſs than the Earth's Chaos was: elſe ſhe could never have been ſo little. For a larger Chaos would have contained more matter; and more matter would have made her Dimenſions bigger. But if the Chaos out of which the Moon was made, was forty times leſs than that out of which the Earth aroſe; then its central Earth, together with its Abyſs, and exterior Orb, muſt be ſo much leſs than the ſame parts of the Earth reſpectively were, as being made of Ingredients which were forty times leſs than theirs. And ſo the Orb of the Moon could not poſſibly be thicker than the Orb of the Earth; nor could its Mountains be higher than the Earths Mountains are, much leſs above *four* times higher, upon that account. And then as to the *falling of its Ruines*, if we allow it to have been done with all imaginable Advantages; which way could they have pil'd themſelves up ſo much higher than the ruines of the Earth? Eſpecially if we conſider that their Materials were alike (I ſpeak of the primitive Bodies of the Earth and Moon) their Figures alike, and alſo the manner of their Diſſolution. Only if we ſuppoſe the Earth to have been twenty thouſand miles in perimeter; the Moon muſt be leſs than five hundred.

As to the Hiſtorical Arguments alledg'd in this caſe, he demands over and over why they were mention'd. But ſuch Queſtions had an anticipative Anſwer made to them in our Diſcourſe; and that excuſes all farther reply. *p.* 207.

In the next place he falls upon the Excepter's Conjecture about the *Original of Mountain.* And in this New Hypotheſis as he calls it, he finds *many palpable defects* *Anſw. p.* 45, 46.

defects or overſights; *whereof*, he ſays, *this is one of the groſſeſt, that he ſuppoſes the Sun, by his heat. the third day to have raiſed the Mountains of the Earth*; *whereas the Sun was not created till the fourth day.* But here he relapſes into his wonted Infirmity of *Miſtaking* egregiouſly. For firſt the Excepter did not ſuppoſe that the *Sun alone* rais'd the Earth's Mountains. This plainly appears from what he ſaid in his entrance upon the Conjecture. *That Nature might have a* **conſiderable ſtroke** *in the Work.* And if *Nature* were to have but *a conſiderable ſtroke* in that work, the *whole* of it could not be done by the *Sun.* No, the *main* part of it was ſtill to be effected by the hand of GOD. And the concurrence of his Power with the influence of the Sun, in producing Mountains, the Excepter acknowledged in theſe words. Tho GOD **could**, *and 'tis like* **did** *produce them another way*; *I will venture to gueſs* HE *might do it thus.* So that ſtill it was HE, that is, GOD, who thus produced the Mountains, not the Sun alone. And then follows an account how or wherein the Sun *help'd* forward this extraordinary Work; tho he muſt not be underſtood to accompliſh the ſame by his own *ſole* and proper efficiency; but as he was an Inſtrument in the hand of Omnipotence, and ſo inabled to do that which of himſelf he could never have done. Tho I muſt add withal, that at that time he was capable of doing a great deal in this Work. For 1ſt, Perhaps he had *then* no Maculae about him; which now ſwimming upon his face in great abundance, do check, and damp, and weaken his influence. 2dly, There being then a *Flatuous Moiſture* in the Earth, put into it on purpoſe to make it Heave; His piercing Beams ſoon gave it ſuch an heat and agitation, as made it dilate it ſelf with furious Rarefaction. 3ly, The Earth it ſelf being then moſt light, and ſoft, and unctuous;

Another Miſtake.

Diſc. p. 208.

Diſc. p. 209.

ous; was alſo of a more pliant yielding nature, and ſo more apt and eaſie to aſcend. Laſtly, The Pores of this Earth being then cloſe ſhut; and the vehement Vapours rarefy'd within, having no other poſſible way to get out, but by elevating the Ground which lay upon them, and ſo confin'd and kept them down: no wonder if they threw it up with a mighty Force, and made it riſe into many and prodigious inequalities. And theſe things are here mention'd the rather, as being a full anſwer to a Queſtion that is put. Namely, *why we have no Mountains made now.* It might as well have been askt, Why does not the Fire make a *down-bak'd* Loaf ſwell and huff up; becauſe it made it do ſo when it was *Dough*? But *then* it was a ſoft and puffy Maſs; whereas *ſince*, it is hardned; and the ſtrength of that Leaven, which was put into it, is wholly ſpent. And ſuch is the changed State of the Earth. It is dried and hardned very much over what it was: and its Original fermentive flatulent Principle, deſigned to aſſiſt in blowing it up, is quite exhauſted. And tho GOD himſelf did cooperate with the Sun, in the production of Mountains; yet ſtill this Anſwer muſt be fully ſatisfactory, as to the Queſtion propounded. For when ſubject matter grows indiſpos'd, or ſecondary Cauſes flagg and fail: the firſt and great Cauſe moſt *commonly* ſtops, and ceaſes to act. GOD *ordinarily* limits his Almighty Power by the Creatures Capacity. And where he is pleas'd to make uſe of means, if thoſe be wanting, he does nothing of himſelf; as being deſtitute of their concomitant Cauſality. And if He did not thus deſiſt from acting, He muſt violate the Laws which he has given to Nature; and invert or diſſolve that fixt Regularity, or methodical Order, that His Wiſdom has appointed and eſtabliſht in the Univerſe. Thus, He gives us Fruits, but Plants bear them: He gives

Anſw. p. 48.

gives us Plants, but Rains nouriſh them: He gives us Rains, but Clouds diſburſe them: and thoſe Clouds ariſe from Vapours; and thoſe Vapours are exhal'd from the Earth; and that Exhalation is perform'd by the Sun. So that take but one Cauſe out of this whole Series of them, and this orderly train of Effects would ceaſe, notwithſtanding the Power of ALMIGHTY GOD; as depending ſecondarily upon the entireneſs of this chain of Cauſes, the agency of which muſt needs be ſuſpended or finally ſtopt, upon the disjunction or interruption of their effective connexion or concatenation. Thus alſo he gives Sight to Animals, but it is by their Eyes; He gives them hearing, but it is by their Ears: and if their Organs fail, their Senſes muſt do ſo. In like manner he thought fit to give Mountains to the Earth; but then it was by imparting ſuch an Habit to it, or by conferring ſuch Qualities upon it, as might prepare and diſpoſe it towards their Production. And thoſe Qualities being perfectly altered; and that Habit decayed or deſtroyed: we are not now to expect that more Mountains ſhould be raiſed. And tho we never ſuppos'd the Sun could make them alone; yet we hope it will be granted that GOD and the Sun could eaſily do it. That They could raiſe the vaſteſt Mountains of all, in the Northern parts of the Earth: Yea, even mighty *Taurus* it ſelf. As in making Rivers, the *Anſwer* ſays (p. 15.) the Waters were *accelerated by a divine hand*; ſo in raiſing Mountains the Sun might be aſſiſted by the ſame. But for the Excepter to have ſuppoſed that that, and other Mountains, were drawn up by the *ſole* power of the Sun; would have been to run himſelf under the Dint of his own Invective againſt *abuſing* Philoſophy, by *ſcrewing it too high.*

Diſc. p. 34. &c.

But Secondly; as the Anſwerer miſtook greatly concerning the *Thing*: ſo he miſtook as greatly concerning the

Another Miſtake.

the *Time*. For the Excepter was ſo far from ſuppoſing that the Sun did raiſe the Mountains *on the third day*: that he ſuppoſed them to *iſſue forth into being*, but *as faſt as Nature could permit*. Not that they were produced *by a far diſtant ſucceſſion* neither (as he ſays in the ſame ſentence) *but all together*; that is, in a ſhort ſpace of time, as faſt as they could well be, one after another. And however the *Earlieſt*, that is to ſay, the *Maritime* Mountains, and ſuch as were made with the *Hollow* of the Sea, muſt riſe when that was ſunk or depreſſed; yet touching the *Inland* ones, in raiſing which the Sun was cencern'd: he ſaid, as plainly as he could ſpeak, that in ſome Countries they were produced *earlier*, and in ſome *later*. And could he ſuppoſe then that *the Sun by his heat, raiſed them the third day*? How ſtrange is it that an Anſwerer ſhould thus run on in *Miſtaking*? That having once got into the way of doing it, he ſhould never know when to come out of it again? Surely by fair and juſt dealings with the Excepter, he had better conſulted his own *eaſe*, as well as his Credit. For by making theſe falſe charges upon him, he occaſion'd himſelf the trouble of ſpending moſt of this long Chapter, in confuting nothing? by things which he took to be *plainly unanſwerable*. For ſtill we ſtand the ground of our Conjecture, and are like to abide unmoved by it. Namely, that Nature had a *conſiderable ſtroke* in making the Mountains; and *tho GOD* could, *and tis like* did *produce them* another *way*; yet He might do it *partly* by the inſtrumental Efficiency of the *Sun*; raiſing the Inland ones ſome *earlier*, and ſome *later*; *but all together as faſt as Nature could permit*. Tho when GOD cauſed the Sun to raiſe the Mountains, it was as he cauſed the Earth to bring forth Trees on the third day, after the Waters were drained off it: that is by a ſpecial Bleſſing

ib. p. 202.

Ib. p. 203.

Anſw. p. 49.

Gen. 1. 12.

ſing and Divine aſſiſtance. And ſo he might cauſe thoſe Trees again to bring forth Fruits; and thoſe Fruits to ripen by that time *Adam* was created; that ſo they might be in a readineſs for his nouriſhment. And here it may be remembred that what the Excepter ſaid in this matter, as to GOD's producing the Mountains by the inſtrumentality of the Sun; was but to *humour Philoſophy* (*Diſc. p.* 208.) and was meerly *conjectural*: *I will* venture *to* guess *he might do it thus.* (*p.* 209.)

Diſc. p. 215. The laſt argument to prove that there were Mountains in the Firſt World, was this. There were *Metals* in it; which are uſually found at the Roots of Moun-

Anſw. p. 49. tains. And here he tells the Excepter, that *he's hard put to it, to prove that the Theoriſt hath any where aſſerted, whatſoever he thought, that there were no Metals then.* Yet he *did* prove it, and that ſo plainly, that the Anſwerer (if he conſiders) will be much harder put to it to deny it. The proof conſiſts of his own words,

Diſc. p. 216. cited out of the *Engliſh* Theory (*p.* 244.) *As for ſubterraneous things,* Metals, *and Minerals, I believe they had* none *in the firſt Earth: and the happier they; no Gold, nor Silver, nor Courſer* Metals. And then he proceeds to give *Reaſons* why there could be none. And does not he that ſays, he *believes* there were no Metals in the Earth; and then gives *Reaſons* why there could be none; and declares men were *happier* becauſe there were none: *aſſert* that there were no Metals?

See *Diſc. c.* 10. § *ult.* But that there were Metals before the Flood, was ſhewed from the Building of *Noah's* Ark; from the building of *Cain's* City; and from *Tubal Cain's* being an Inſtructer of every Artificer in Braſs and Iron.

Anſw. p. 49. To the Firſt Inſtance it is anſwered. That *Scripture* does not mention *Iron Tools* in Building the Ark, but only *Gopher Wood* and *Pitch*: and therefore *'tis a Preſumption*

ſumption rather; that there were no other Materials us'd. Had the Theoriſt kept cloſe to holy *Scripture*, and regulated his Principles and Hypotheſis by that; none of this Controverſie or Diſpute had happened. But now, we ſee, where he has *leaſt reaſon* for it; there he is forwardeſt to adhere to it. As if it were a Fate on him, for deſerting it ſo much in *other* Caſes, and going againſt it. If he can preſume that the Ark was made of *Gopher Wood* and *Pitch* only, becauſe Scripture *mentions* nothing elſe: why could he not admit of a *Sea* as well, which the Scripture mentions every whit as expreſly? Or if Scripture's *Silence* concerning Things, be a ground of *Preſumption* that they were not; what then ſhall we think of an Oval and unmountainous Earth, an incloſed Abyſs, a Paradiſiacal World, and the like; which the Scripture makes *no* mention of? Surely *'tis a preſumption rather* that there were no ſuch things. But not to digreſs. What kind of Fabrick the Ark was, the H. GHOST informs us. Three hundred Cubits long, fifty broad, and thirty high. Made with three Stories; divided into Rooms; and having a Window above, and a Door on its Side. Now it being ſo great a Veſſel, it could not be made but of very ſtrong and ſubſtantial Timber. Eſpecially if we conſider the uſe or ſervice whereunto it was appointed. For beſides Mankind, ſeven clean Beaſts, and as many Fowls, and two unclean of every ſort, were to be preſerved alive in it, and that for above the ſpace of a whole Year. And ſo it was to hold their food likewiſe, as well as themſelves; and to carry them all, upon deep, and ſpatious, and boundleſs Waters. And it being neceſſary upon theſe accounts, that it ſhould be fram'd of ſtrong Timber; in caſe it was done *without* Iron Tools, what can be thought, but that *Noah* and his Sons muſt pluck up well grown Trees by the Roots;

Gen. 6. 15, 6.

and then whole, and round, and rough as they were, faſten them together with ſtore of Pitch? But how all the pains and art in the World, could make this Ark of due form and ſtrength, in ſuch a Method, and of ſuch Materials; who can imagine, beſides our Anſwerer? Doubtleſs *Noah* had a ſingular knack at Ark-making, that he could raiſe ſuch a Structure all out of whole Trees; and when he had plac'd them in their order, could fix them in it, meerly by Pitching them *within* Gen. 6. 14. *and without*. And ſo well did he fix them, that neither the fall of the Earth, nor the fury of the Flood, could move them one jot. Yet what was ever ſo raging and tumultuous as that mighty Flood? Let the Theoriſt Eng. Theor. p. 99. deſcribe it. *No Sea was ever ſo tumultuous as this, nor is there any thing in preſent Nature to be compar'd with the diſorder of theſe Waters; All the Poetry, and all Hyperboles that are us'd in the deſcription of Storms and raging Seas, were literally true in this, if not beneath it: The Ark was really carry'd to the tops of higheſt Mountains, and into the places of the Clouds, and thrown down again into the deepeſt Gulfs.* Brave Ark! and as bravely built; that could endure all this, and yet never ſpring ſo much as one Tree. What would our Merchants give, I'll warrant you, for Ships of ſuch Gopher Wood and Pitch? But alas! this ſtrong way of building, was calculated only for the Deluge. The Myſtery of doing it left the World together with the Equinox: and never ſince the Earth has ſtood awry, could Men lay Trees ſo well in Pitch.

In anſwer to the Second Inſtance it is ſuppoſed; that the City built by *Cain*, *was a number of Cottages,* Anſw. p. 50. *made of branches of Trees, of Oſiers, and Bulruſhes; and what needed they any other houſes, when the Air was ſo temperate?* But Firſt, This Suppoſition is bottom'd upon a falſe Foundation. For they who conceive the City

City *Enochia* to be ſo mean; commonly think it was ſo for want of *Workmen*, not for lack of *Tools* to build it. But *that* being not built till after the death of *Abel*; and *he* being not ſlain before the hundred and twenty ninth year of *Adam*; by that time there might be Myriads of men upon the Earth; and ſo *great ſtore* of Architects. And therefore *Cain's* City need not be ſuppoſed to conſiſt of ſuch Cottages; becauſe there was a ſcarcity of good Artificers. Secondly, To ſay *the Air was ſo temperate* then, as that there *needed* no other than Oſier Cottages; is to take that for determin'd, which is under debate. And beſides, houſes are rear'd for other uſes, as well as for Defenſatives againſt intemperate Air. And in Cities commonly they are beſt and moſt ſumptuous. Thirdly, It is thought that *Cain* built this City for his own ſafety. Being full of guilt, and ſo of fear; he was for dwelling in a ſtrong place. But what fortifications were Mud-walls and Oſiers capable of? Such a Fortreſs could yield but a little ſatisfaction to his mind, as being a poor defence or ſecurity to his Perſon. Fourthly, If *Henochia* did not outſtand the Flood, we are better aſſured that *Joppa* did. And then, we hope, it muſt be built of ſuch Materials, as could not be fitted and made into Ædifices, without the help of Iron Tools.

Poterant illo ſpatio non centuriæ, ſed Myriades, hominum eſſe. Maref. in Refut. Fab. Præad. Qu. 3.

Ad ſui defenſionem, quia ſemper erat in timore & tremore poſitus. Lyr. in *Gen.* 4. 17.

And whereas it is urged, that the Excepter ſays, that the *Indians* had no Inſtruments of Iron, when the *Spaniards* came amongſt them: That's very true. But then they built no ſuch Ark as *Noah's* was; nor had they any *Tubals*, Maſter-Black-ſmiths, Braziers, *&c.* in their Country. Nor were there *ſuch* Cities found amongſt them, as we have reaſon to believe were erected in good plenty before the Deluge. For here methinks the Rule of *Hornius*, which he lays down in his *Introduction to the Ancient Geography*, may take place.

Anſw. p. 10.

Si quis mente concipere velit, qualis ante diluvium terrarum facies fuerit, is ſibi totidem poſt diluvium ſecula proponat, & inde, de præteritis conjecturam faciat. *If any one would conceive in his mind, what kind of face the Earth had before the Flood, let him caſt with himſelf how it was ſo many ages after the Flood, and from thence gueſs concerning thoſe that are paſt.* And ſo there muſt be as many Cities in the World, at the time of the Flood, as there was ſince the flood, about the time of *Nebuchadnezzar:* it being as long from the Deluge to his time; as it was from the Creation to the Deluge. And tho he takes notice, that no Cities are remembred by Writers, but *Henoch*, by *Moſes*; and *Joppa* by profane Authors; yet he puts the Queſtion, Quis dubitet adeò jam aucto genere humano, plurimas regiones, imò totam penè *Aſiam* & *Egyptum*, Urbibus, oppidis, pagis, ante diluvium fuiſſe exornatas. *Who can doubt, that very many countries, yea, almoſt all* Aſia *and* Egypt, *were garniſhed with Cities, Towns, and Villages, before the flood; mankind being ſo increaſed?*

Anſw. p. 50. To his Queſtions, how the Children of *Cain* came to *find out* Iron; and then to know the *Nature and uſe* of it; and then the way of *preparing and tempering* it: I think we may reply; that in this matter they had inſtructions from *Adam*, as he had his knowledge from GOD. Or if we ſhould ſay, they underſtood this by Inſpiration, it would be no raſh or extravagant aſſertion. For why might not ſome of *Cain's* Children be inſpired to find out Braſs, *&c.* as well as *Aholiab* was inſpired to work in it, *Exod.* 31. 3, 5.? And yet they might find out Iron, and other Metals in a lower way than that. For the Flaming Sword at the Eaſt of *Eden*, might be a *burning* of the Earth (*Diſcourſe p.* 270.) And that it could not be the *Torrid Zone* (as the Theory allows it to have been) two Reaſons were given

(*Diſc.*

(*Diſc. p.* 272.) Tho neither is anſwered but by the *Laſt Expedient*. Now the Earth being once fired, and burning continually; at length it might reach to ſome Mine below, and melting the Metal, cauſe it to run, and boil up upon the Ground. And then obſervation and wiſe experience, could not but lead men into a ſpeedy acquaintance with its Nature and Uſe: And alſo make the firſt Iron that they had, inſtrumental in helping them to procure more. Thus (according to *Herodotus*, *lib.* 7. and *Natalis Comes*, *lib.* 9.) the *Idæi Dactyli* (the ſame with the *Curetes* or *Corybantes*) both found out Iron, and learnt the Art of uſing it; by the burning of *Ida*. And why then might not the Progeny of *Cain*, both get Iron, and skill in it, the ſame way? But however they came by Iron, or by skill to uſe it, and make Tools of it; 'tis certain that they had it, and that's enough for us. And truly if they had not made *Tools* of it alſo, *Jubal* could no more have attain'd to his *Art*; than his Brother *Tubal* could have taught his *Trade*. *Jubal* was *the Father of all ſuch as handle the Harp and Organ*, *Gen.* 4. 21. And how could ſuch Muſical Inſtruments be made without Iron Tools? But now I think on't, there might be *Gopher Wood* and *Pitch* as well in *Jubal*'s time, as there was in *Noah*'s: and they might ſerve as well to make the Harp and Organ of the one; as they did to make the Ark of the other, without Tools of Iron. Yet then the miſchief on't is, *Scripture does not mention either*: and therefore according to the Anſwerer's Rule above, *'tis a preſumption rather, that there were no ſuch Materials uſ'd upon thoſe occaſions*. But then 'tis a preſumption withal, that no ſuch Harp or Organ were made. And another as ſhrewd a preſumption will follow: that *Jubal* was a Father without Children. Or if you will, that he could not poſſibly be a Father of Muſick himſelf, becauſe he wanted

wanted Inſtruments whereon to learn: nor could he poſſibly beget any Sons of that Science, becauſe he had no Inſtruments whereby to teach.

He anſwers the laſt inſtance thus. *As to* Tubal Cain, *let thoſe that poſitively aſſert that there was no Iron in the firſt World, tell us in what ſenſe that place is to be underſtood. I believe Iron or Braſs is not once mention'd in all the Theory.* But why ſo indirect an Anſwer? One would think that the Argument here, which conſiſts of Iron, were red-hot, to ſee how he handles it. And the truth is, let him touch it never ſo Gingerly, it will all at once both burn his Fingers, and Brand his Hypotheſis. *Iron or Braſs is not once mention'd in all the Theory.* Very good: Yet for all that, the Theoriſt flatly denies the being of them *both*, before the Flood. The Clauſe fore-cited witneſſeth as much. **Metals** *and Minerals, I believe they had* **none** *in the firſt Earth.* And if they had *no Metals*, for certain they had *no Iron* nor *Braſs*. He adds; *the happier they; no Gold, nor Silver, nor* **courſer Metals**. If therefore Iron and Braſs, be *Courſer Metals* than Gold and Silver; he excludes *them* out of the firſt World, as much as he does the finer ones named. Nor does he more abſolutely exclude them by his *words*; than he effectually barrs them out of the firſt State of Nature, by the *tenour* of his Hypotheſis. For that lodges the Abyſs betwixt the Central and External Earth, and ſo renders their Aſcent from below, into the ſuperior Terreſtial Region, quite impoſſible. And ſo what ſorry and unmanly ſhifting is this? And all to ſave the down-right acknowledgement of an Error; which would have been more ingenuous, and I think, more eaſie. 'Tis unlucky for one to run his Head againſt a Poſt. But when he has done, if he will ſay he did not do it, and ſtand in and defend what he ſays; 'tis a ſign he is as ſenſeleſs, as he was unfortunate;

nate; and is fitter to be pitied, than confuted. Good is the advice of the Son of *Sirach*; *In no wiſe ſpeak againſt the Truth, but be abaſhed of the error of thine Ignorance*, *Eccus.* 4. 25.

CHAP. XI.

THat there was an *Open Sea* before the Flood, the Excepter proved by *Scripture* and by *Reaſon*, in his Eleventh Chapter. But the Anſwerer inverts the Order of that Chapter, and thinks fit to begin with the laſt firſt. As if he deſigned by altering the Method, to perplex the Matter, and pervert the Arguments. Or at leaſt to raiſe ſuch a Miſt of Confuſion, as might dim the Eye of the Reader's Obſervation, and partly obſcure the Weakneſs of his Anſwer. But let us follow him in his own way, and not fear in the leaſt, but 'twill be every whit as eaſy for us. For indeed let him go even which way he pleaſes, we are bound in Juſtice to give him this Commendation; that he never leads us into any difficulties.

The *Reaſon* offered in proof of an Open Sea, was this. Becauſe otherwiſe the ſubterraneous Abyſs muſt have been the Receptacle for Fiſhes, or *the only place of their abode.* And *that Abyſs could by no means have been a fit Dwelling for them*, upon Three Accounts: As being too *Dark*, too *Cloſe*, and too *Cold*. *Dſc. p.* 224.

But the Anſwerer would perſwade us to believe otherwiſe. *As for* **Coldneſs**, *methinks*, ſays he, *he might have left that out, unleſs he ſuppoſes that there are no Fiſh in the frozen Seas, towards the North and South; which is againſt all ſenſe and experience: for Cold Countrys abound moſt in Fiſh.* But are there any where any frozen Seas, on which the Sun never ſhin'd for ſixteen hundred years together? He muſt ſhow us *ſuch* Seas, *Anſw. p.* 51.

if

if he would bring his Anſwer home to the Objection. For in whatſoever Seas Fiſhes do breed, thoſe Seas muſt certainly at times, feel a great deal of Warmth and Influence from the Sun: elſe theſe Creatures, ſo cold of themſelves, could never Multiply. And therefore, we ſee, that even in *our* Seas, they breed not in *Winter*, for want of the Sun. And if the Sun's Declination or withdrawment from us, hinders their Production in our Seas (and Rivers) as ſenſe and experience ſufficiently teſtifie; his *total* Abſence and conſtant Excluſion, would put a final ſtop to their Procreation. Yet ſuch was his Abſence, and ſuch his Excluſion from the inclos'd Abyſs. It may be made a Queſtion, whether Fiſhes can live and breed in a Deep Well, which is open; by reaſon of its Coldneſs. And if they cannot, how much leſs in the Abyſs? which being cloſe, and much Deeper; was anſwerably colder. In caſe it be objected, that in ſuch a Well they would lack Nouriſhment: the Objection turns much more forcibly upon the Abyſs. For whereas the ſmaller Sorts of Fiſh live on Flies and Worms; where ſhould they have found them ſo far under ground? And yet neceſſary it was that the leſſer Kinds of Fiſh ſhould exiſt; that ſo they might be food, and ſuſtenance for the Greater.

Anſw. p. 51.

As for *Darkneſs* and *Cloſeneſs*; he oppoſes to them *the Saying of* Maimonides, *That no man ever would believe, that a Child could live ſo many months, ſhut up in its Mothers Belly, if he had never ſeen the experience of it.* For, ſays the Anſwerer, *there's Cloſeneſs and Darkneſs in the higheſt degree: and in Animals, that, as ſoon as born, cannot live without Reſpiration.* But ſurely the Difference betwixt Children in the Womb, and Fiſhes in the Abyſs; is very great. For 1ſt. Children unborn, are imperfect; (and ſo indeed they are, when new born, and long after; (they may be perfect in Shape,

Shape, but they are imperfect in ſtrength:) But with Fiſhes in the Abyſs, it could not be ſo. Secondly, Children in the Womb, have no local Motion; which to Fiſhes in the Abyſs, muſt be allowed. Thirdly, Children in the womb, are ſupply'd with ſutable and ſufficient Nouriſhment, by eaſy and natural Derivation from their Mothers: But Fiſhes in the Abyſs, were to ſeek out for theirs, and to get it when, and where they could find it. Fourthly, Fiſhes in the Abyſs, were to propagate there; (A ſure Indication of their true Perfection in that State:) But Children unborn, were far enough from doing that. Laſtly, That great Body of water, being cloſe ſhut up, and always quieſcent, and having no way to purge and clarify it ſelf; would have putrified, and poyſoned all the Fiſh; eſpecially if it inclin'd to any degree of warmth, as the Anſwerer here ſurmiſes: *There would be more danger of too much warmth.* But from this Inconvenience, in their vital Habitation (ſuppoſing it to continue in its natural State) Children in the Womb are free. *Ib.*

And whereas he urges that Fiſhes *Prey on the night time*: That ſignifies nothing. For firſt, the Darkneſs of our nights *above* the Earth; is not comparable to the Darkneſs a Mile *under* it. And Secondly, in very dark nights. 'tis like they prey only upon dead Baits; or upon ſuch living ones, as are ſet for them, and made ſo faſt that they cannot get away. And to his Objection, of *Fiſhes living in ſubterraneous Lakes*; the reply is as eaſy. For no ſubterraneous Lakes in which Fiſhes live; are ſo *cloſe*, and deep into the Earth; as this pretended ſubterraneous Abyſs. *Ib.*

But farther; that there was an *Open Sea* in the primæval World, the Excepter prov'd, againſt the Theory, from *Scripture*. And the firſt Argument, was the *Dominion* which GOD gave unto *Adam*, *over the Fiſh* *Diſc. p. 219, 226*

of the Sea. Gen. 1. 26, 28. But if there were not an *open Sea*, impoſſible it was, that he ſhould have or exerciſe ſuch a Dominion as GOD ALMIGHTY gave him. Whereunto it is anſwered thus. Adam *had* no more *Dominion given him over the Fiſh of the Sea, than over the Fowls of the Air.* And did the Excepter affirm that he had? Let it be granted that he had but as *much*; and our Buſineſs is done, and ſo is the Theoriſt's. This, the Gentleman knew very well; and therefore we ſee how ſhie he is of a direct Anſwer, and how aloof he ſtands in what he ſays. As for *Adam*'s Power over the *Fowls*, it was ſufficient; ſuch as ſhewed his Dominion to be real. For he exercis'd it *then*, at leaſt as much as we do *now*. That is, he could take them in Fields, or Fens, or Heaths, or Rivers; and have them in good plenty about Him. But had he an equal power over the Fiſh, when they kept only in a ſubterraneous Pond; and that was wall'd round at ſuch a rate, that even through all his long life, he could not command ſo much as a Pair of Sprats? He adds, concerning the Fowls; that Adam *could not come at them. or ſeize them at his pleaſure, unleſs he could fly into the Air after them.* Very much to the purpoſe. As if he could have had no Dominion over the Fowls, without the uſe of Wings. And becauſe he had not a Power over the *Fowls*, above his capacity; and ſuch a Command as neither *his* Nature and Circumſtances, nor *theirs* would allow: therefore he had none at all over the *Fiſh*. Notably argu'd, and with mighty good Conſequence. *Adam* was not tall enough to ſtand upon the ground, and take the Weather-cock of a Church-ſteeple; and therefore, good man, he could not ſtand upon tip-toe neither. Becauſe he had not ſuch a Dominion over the Sea, as was impoſſible; therefore he could not have one of which he was capable. Certainly

Anſw. p. 52.

Ib.

tainly he muſt be akin to the Sages of *Gotham*, who argues that Man is not Lord of the Creatures, becauſe they could not hedge in the poor Cuckow; or drown the Eel as they might have done a Kitling.

When a King makes a Gentleman, Lord-Lieutenant of a County; by virtue of his Commiſſion, is he preſently the ſtrongeſt man that is in it? Does it inable him to encounter whole Regiments of Souldiers in his ſingle Perſon; or to vanquiſh all the Militia under him, at once? Does it impower him to carry a Canon upon his Neck? Or when the great Gun is fir'd off, to catch the Bullet as it flies, and put it up in his Pocket? Can he not hold the place, and execute the Office of a Lord-Lieutenant, without ſuch preternatural and monſtrous abilities? So when GOD gave *Adam* Dominion over the Fowls; did he mean that he ſhould dive like a Duck, or ſoar like a Falcon? That he ſhould ſwim as naturally as the Swan; and hunt the Kite, or Hobby, as Boys do the Wren? Did he mean that he ſhould hang up Oſtritches in a Cage, as people do Linnets? Or fetch down the Eagles to feed with his Pullen, and make them perch with his Chickens in the Henrooſt? Or elſe could he have no command over the Fowls? And in like manner when he gave the ſame *Adam* Dominion over the Sea; was he to be able to dwell at the bottom, or to walk on the top of it? To drain it as a Ditch; or take all its Fry at once in a Drag-net? Was he to Snare the *Shark* as we do young *Pickarels*? Or to bridle the *Sea-Horſe*, and ride him for his Pad? Or to put a ſlip upon the *Crocodiles* Neck, and play with him as with a Dog? Or elſe muſt he have no Dominion over that Element, and the Creatures in it? Certainly betwixt having Dominion over the Fowls, *and flying after them in the Air*; there is great difference. And ſo there is betwixt the real Do-

minion which *Adam* had over the Sea, and its Fiſh; and all exceſs or extravagance of Rule.

When GOD ſet *Adam* over the Fiſh of the Sea, he plac'd him under his Glorious SELF. For had his Dominion been ſupreme and abſolute, he muſt have partook of GOD's Nature; as well as he did of his Image, and Empire. But as we very well know, all Subordinate Power muſt be limited: and ſo was *Adam*'s. And therefore he could not go beyond his preſcribed Bounds; but was to command the Fiſh, as he did other Creatures. That is, according to the Order of the World, and the Laws of Providence; according to the Capacity of his own Nature, and the Quality of theirs. And if ſo be he did but act in his Station, in purſuance of his Commiſſion; governing his Subjects as in Duty he was obliged, and as in Power he was inabled; that is, according to the Will of GOD, and the meaſures of a Man: this will be ſufficient for *him* who *had* the Dominion; and ſo it will be for *us* who *defend* it.

R. 521 The Anſwerer proceeds; *Adam was made Lord of all Animals upon the Earth, and had a right to uſe them for his conveniency, when they came into his power.* Here he ſpeaks as out of a Cloud; and we may juſtly ſuſpect that what he ſays, had need be clear'd from doubtful meaning. For Fiſhes, if his Hypotheſis may be believed, were never upon *this Earth*, but always *under it*, during *Adam*'s time; and ſo they never *came into his power* neither. And therefore it may be queſtion'd, whether he means that *Adam* was Lord of *them* or not. But if in, *all Animals*, he includes the *Fiſhes*; then we reply as follows. That in caſe the Doctrine of the Theory be true, *Adam* could be but a poor and ſorry Lord over the Fiſhes; which are a conſiderable part of the living Creatures. *Pliny* attempts, in his *Natural Hiſtory*, to reduce all of them, that belong to the Sea, to

Lib. 32. C. 11.

an

an hundred ſeventy and ſix kinds; and to particularize the ſeveral Names of them reſpectively. But ſo mean a Lord was *Adam* over them, that indeed to call him by this Title, in reference to thoſe Animals; would be but to put an affront upon him, he enjoying no more (if the Theoriſt errs not) than a meer colour or ſhadow of that honour. Should an Emperor grant one of his Courtiers a Commiſſion, to be his Vice-Roy, or Deputy, in a certain Country, which 'tis utterly impoſſible he ſhould ever come at; as this Patent would reproach the Majeſty that gives it, ſo would it not be Mockage to the Favourite that receives it? Yet juſt ſuch is the Caſe here. As impoſſible it was for *Adam* to come at the Abyſs below; as it was for him to dart downward, for a Mile or two's Thickneſs, through the compact and ſolid Earth. So that his Lordſhip over the Fiſhes there, muſt be a bare nominal and titular thing. And he might as well have been Lord over the Fiſh in the Moon (ſuppoſing ſhe had any) as over the Fiſh in the Infernal Sea. For his deſcent to the one, was as difficult, as his aſcent would have been to the other; and his Power was exercis'd alike in both: for he died above ſeven hundred years, before the *Ocean*, or ſo much as *one Fiſh*, appeared in the World. Now pray, when, or to whom? in what Ages, and to which of his Servants, did the GOD of Heaven ever aſſign ſuch mock Seigniories, and pitiful airy Royalties, as this? No, they are windy promiſes that convey empty Donatives; and *neither* can proceed from that Glorious Being, which is the fulneſs of Sincerity and all Munificence. Where GOD is pleas'd to impart Dominion; we may aſſure our ſelves it ſhall not be a name or empty notion. But as there ſhall be a Scæne for Juriſdiction to act in; ſo there ſhall be Subjects for it to be exercis'd upon; and Matters alſo to imploy it about.

And

And ſo here is ſomething *more* ſuggeſted (in way of Reply) as to the Favour which GOD beſtowed upon *Adam*, in relation to the Fiſhes: namely, that he imparted to him a *Dominion* over them. And *that* I hope, is quite different from a *Titular Lordſhip*. And ſo Titular was his Lordſhip (according to the Theory) over the Fiſh; that tho he held it near a thouſand years, it did not all that time bring one of them to his *Sight*. A man may have a Title to things, and Right to uſe them when he can get them; tho he never had, nor ever ſhall have Dominion over them. I do by no means wiſh the Anſwerer to be unjuſtly barred from his Eſtate. But if he were ſo, he would find that a Title to it, and a Right to uſe it when it ſhould come into his Power; muſt not be compar'd to a real Dominion or Command over it. But now it was an *actual Dominion* which GOD gave *Adam* over the Fiſh. And therefore he did not ſay, *have thou the* Title *of* Lord *over them, and* uſe *them for thy conveniency, when they come into thy power*; (which yet would have been a plain Jeer (ſuch as Heaven never put upon an Innocent) becauſe into his power they were *not* to come:) but *have DOMINION* over the Fiſh of the Sea, *and over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living thing which moveth upon the Earth*, Gen. 1. 28. Where, ורדו, which the *Targum* renders, וישלישו, *and have the Dominion*; does ſignify an *actual* Rule, and the very *exerciſe* of it. And the Word is uſed in this Senſe, in too many Places of the H. Bible to be here recited. So that *Adam's* Dominion over the Fiſh, was not (as the Anſwerer would moſt unreaſonably make it) a Titular Lordſhip, or imaginary Right: which was to hang in the Air, and not be realiz'd even to his Poſterity, till above ſixteen hundred Years ſhould be paſt; and till the World in which they lived ſhould be quite deſtroyed, and a new one founded:

ſounded: but it was a *real* Power *actually* conferred *upon*, and exercis'd *in* his own Perſon; and *with* him, by his Children, *jointly*; and *after* him, by *them*, *ſucceſſively*. And truly when in the Grant of this power over the Fiſh, the Advantage lay ſo much on *Adam*'s ſide, more than on his Offſpring's; (it being made to him in his Perſon, and alſo in his Innocence:) it may ſeem ſomewhat ſtrange, that he who ſhared moſt in the *conveyance* of the Priviledge; ſhould (in the Judgment of a wiſe *Civilian*) have nothing to do with the *Poſſeſſion* of it. Eſpecially when this Grant was made by the GOD of faithfulneſs and truth; with Whom, as there is no ſhadow of Change, ſo there can be no ſemblance of Fraud. Yet had the Caſe here been as the Theory makes it; there muſt have been *wrong* on GOD's part, as well as *fallacy*; and his creatures he muſt have injured, by impoſing upon them; which who can think? As if that righteous Being, whoſe Nature is the Rule of eternal Juſtice, could violate that Law which Himſelf had made: And when he had commanded, *not to ſteal*; could rob poor men of that common Right, which his own free Goodneſs, and his own kind Promiſe, ſettled on them.

Not to be too tœdious. Either *Adam* had *actual* Dominion over the Fiſh; or he had not. If he had not, why did GOD ſay to him, *Have* **Dominion** *over the Fiſh of the Sea*? If he had, why does the Anſwerer ſo mince it, as if he intended to make away with it? Again; Either *Adam* had as *much* Power over the Fiſh of the Sea, as he had over the Fowls of the Air, and the Living things upon the Earth; or he had not. If he had as much; we have what we contend for. If he had not; the Anſwerer muſt ſhow, that the Divine *Grant* now recited, veſting *Adam* with Dominion over the Creatures; did confer *more Power* in the *latter* part of it, than it did

in

in the *firſt*. But that he cannot do; and therefore his Cauſe is loſt. For if *Adam* had as much power over the Fiſh, as he had over the Fowls, and over other Animals; there muſt be an *open Sea* at firſt. And if there was an open Sea; there was *Mountains* too. And if there was Mountains; there was *Clouds* alſo. And if there was Clouds; there was *Winds*, and *Rains*, and *Hails*, and *Snows*, and *Thunders*, &c. And then where's the Theoriſts Primitive Earth, and his Paradiſiacal World before the Flood? In the Fourth Chapter of his Anſwer he reflected upon the Excepter for *Dabbling* in Philoſophy. And now I think he has *dabbled* in it fairly himſelf; even till he has drowned his hopeful Hypotheſis, in an inclos'd Abyſs. And as for *Extraordinary Providence*, it affords no help in this Caſe. However it be made too much a Pack-horſe to carry the Theory through ſeveral Difficulties, which otherwiſe muſt have been impaſſable: yet here it fails, and is able to yield no manner of aſſiſtance. For he who can imagine, that *Adam* upon the Earth, could have Dominion over the Fiſh in this incloſed Sea, by Extraordinary Providence; muſt be guilty of moſt amazing and unmerciful Extravagance. Yet by another Expedient he may find relief. When, to leave things out, he prints his Theory next; he may leave this inclos'd Abyſs out of that Edition. And tho he can worſe ſpare it; yet whether he has not as much reaſon to leave it out, as he had to leave *any thing* out, which he *did* leave out; let any unbias'd Perſon judge.

Diſc. p. 126.

That there was *Open Seas* before the Flood, we argu'd Secondly, from the *Waters under the Firmament*, *Gen.* 1. 7. For had there been none but *River-waters* in the firſt World; the *Earth* might have been ſaid to be *under the Firmament*, more properly, than the *Waters*. And the Firmament, which in the 6th. verſe, is ſaid to be

be *in the midſt of the Waters*, and *to divide the Waters from the Waters*; might better have been ſaid to be in the midſt betwixt the *Earth* and the *Waters*; and to divide the *Waters* from *that*. For, as for the *River-waters*, they would have been too inconſiderable, to have had the Partition made by the Firmament, prædicated of them, in excluſion of the Earth, or in preference to it. *Ibid.*

Well, allow this, ſays the Anſwerer, *that a Firmament was made to divide the Waters from the Waters. Tell us then what that Firmament was, For it is ſaid there, that GOD ſet the Sun, Moon, and Stars, in the Firmament.* We own it is ſaid ſo, aud that GOD did do ſo. But if he cannot tell what this Firmament was; a few words will inform him. It is plain that *Moſes*, in his Coſmopæia, makes mention of *Two* Firmaments; (and we have told him of them once already.) One we may call the *Aeral*; the other, the *Æthereal* Firmament. The Firſt is the *Interaqueous* Firmament, as lying between Waters: for it is bounded by the Waters here below; and by thoſe ſupernal Fountains of Water, the Clouds above. And yet it is properly called *Heaven*; as being not only limited to, but alſo conſiſting of the Loweſt, or Subnubilar Heaven. The Second is the Firmament of Lights. Becauſe in it the Moon, and all the Planets; the Sun, and all the fixt Stars are placed. And a moſt ſtately and glorious Expanſe it is; as being of immenſe and indefinite Amplitude or Extent. *Anſw. p. 52.* *Diſc. p. 228.* *Gen. 1. 8. 20.*

Here the Excepter encountred that *New Notion* of the Firmament, which the Theoriſt vouchſaft to recommend to the World; where he makes it expreſsly to be the *Orb* of his exterior *habitable* Earth. But what was ſaid againſt it, he anſwered the beſt way, *viz.* by declaring that the *Things cited* and oppoſed, *are not in* *See Diſc. p. 226, 227, 228.* *Anſw. p. 52.*

Auſim enim dicere quantum verum natura innoveſcit adhuc, Firmamentum Moſaicum prout vulgo intelligitur, eſſe prorſus ἀφιλόσοφον Theor. Edit. 1. p. 254.

the Second Edition of the Theory. But the beſt on't is, when he had been ſo *brisk* as to give us all a Magiſterial Reprimand; by telling us plainly that *Moſes's* Firmament as *commonly underſtood*, is an *Unphiloſophic thing*: on the other-ſide he was ſo baſhful, that he would not ſtand by his own opinion, tho more Philoſophic, as he thought. But having conceived it, and brought it forth, he very fairly gives it the ſlip; and leaves the infant Notion, defenceleſs as it is, to ſhift for it ſelf.

Concerning what we ſaid in vindication of the *Clouds* from that contempt which the Thoriſt threw upon them; he thus pronounceth. *With ſubmiſſion to better Judgments, I take it to be a* Country-Sermon, *about the uſefulneſs of Rain.* But I do aſſure him (tho that's no ſtrange nor new thing with him) he is very much miſtaken. Yet if he will needs have it be a Sermon; with ſubmiſſion to better Judgments, I take it to be a *Funeral-Sermon* for one of his Notions. Namely, that *the Clouds were no ſuch eminent and remarkable things, as to deſerve a particular commemoration by* Moſes *in his ſix days work.*

Anſw. p. 53.

Eng. Theor. p. 234.

As for what follows (towards the end of our Chapter) againſt the Theoriſt's Objection, touching the *difficult Propagation of Mankind into the Iſlands and Continents of the firſt world*; the Anſwerer declares, that *it does but confirm his Objection.* But did the Excepter ſay any thing in confirmation of ſuch a Difficulty in the buſineſs of this Propagation; as brings on a Neceſſity of calling in the help of the *Angelic Miniſtery*, to tranſlate or convey men from place to place? He ſhewed plainly, that a few ſorry Sciphs, or rude kind of Boats, might very well do what was here to be done, without making Angels to be Carriers of men, and to tranſport their Colonies, through the *Torrid Zone*, into

Anſw. p. 53.

See *Diſc.* c. 11. §. 7.

into new Plantations. But this is a Difficulty which attends the Theory: or elſe the Anſwerer wrongs his Hypotheſis, by flying to thoſe Spirits for ſuch their Aſſiſtance. *Anſw. p.* 30.

CHAP. XII.

THIS is a ſhort Chapter, and will ſoon be diſpatch'd. So the Anſwerer begins. But his Diſpatch was ſo quick, that he made more haſte than good ſpeed. For beſides that he forgat to leave any thing behind him that needs a Reply: ſuch was his Expedition, that he could not ſee his way before him neither; but ran unhandſomely into the Aſſertion of a plain *Untruth*. For thus he poſitively affirms of the Excepter. *He ſays, GOD might* **as well** *as to ſignificancy, have appointed the* **Sun,** *as the* **Rainbow,** *for a ſign that there ſhould never have been another Flood.* And again, *This would have done* **as well,** *he ſays, as the Rainbow.* But this is utterly falſe; for, as any one may ſee, the Excepter ſaid not ſo. His words are theſe. *If GOD had appointed the Sun to that uſe, he would have ſignified the ſame thing that the Bow does.* But he did not ſay, he would have ſignify'd it *as well*. Nay, in effect, he ſaid the quite contrary, as appears by what follows. *Tho as all muſt grant, the Bow is the* **moſt fit Emblem** *of the two; and therefore it was choſen.* And when the Excepter ſaid, *the Bow is the* **moſt fit Emblem** *of the two*, and that *GOD choſe* it for *that Reaſon*: what did he ſay leſs, than that it muſt do *better* than the Sun; and conſequently that the Sun could not do *ſo well* as *that*? which is contrary to the Anſwerers Affirmation. Another man, I hope, may write *a piece of Natural Hiſtory*, tho he does it not as *well* and *remarkably* as the Theoriſt has done: for there are degrees of Compariſon in doing

Another Untruth. *Ibid. p.* 53. *Ib. p.* 53, 54. *Diſc. p.* 253, 254. *Ib. p.* 254.

things. But will he never leave falſifying, and ſpeak the truth?

Ib. p. 259, 260. As to our Argument proving the *Exiſtence of Clouds* before the Flood; and conſequently the *Appearance of the Rainbow then:* He anſwers it by his *laſt Expedient* only.

CHAP. XIII.

Anſw. p. 55. HE begins this Chapter, which is about *Paradiſe*, with a warm Charge upon the Excepter, thus. He *fairly baulks all the the Difficulties in that Doctrine, and contents himſelf with a few generals, which every body knows.* Betwixt the *Doctrine* and *Difficulties* of an Article, there may be great Difference. And where there is ſo, they muſt be warily noted and diſtinguiſhed. There we muſt duly conſider and examine, whether theſe Difficulties be inherent in the Doctrine, and inſeparable from it; or whether they be Appendages or Additionals to it. Whether the Doctrine delivered were interwoven or wrapt up in Difficulties by GOD; or whether thoſe Difficulties were the meer phantſiful inventions of men, annexed to it, or clapt upon it. And in caſe they appear to be extrinſic Acceſſaries, humane Conjectures, or perhaps Extravagancies and Miſtakes: what have we more to do with them, or how can we do better by them, than part the Shadows from the true Subſtance, and ſo throwing off the one, keep cloſe to the other? And this was what we propoſed to our ſelves, when paſſing by the Fictions of Poets, and the Phantſies of Fathers, we betook our ſelves directly to the Oracles of Heaven; reſolving to take up our Reſt there, and to rely upon nothing that Writers ſay concerning Paradiſe (a Scripture Doctrine) but what is conſonant to the Sacred Scriptures; where alone

Diſc. p. 265.

alone that Doctrine is clearly taught, ſo far as Divine Wiſdom thought fit to reveal it, and acquaint us with it. Tis true, we may go farther if we pleaſe, and ſo ſtretch this Doctrine (as the Theoriſt does) that it ſhall comprehend ſeveral other things. But then if theſe things prove, *Difficulties*; at the ſame time they are but *Superfluities*. Such as GOD never put into the Doctrine of Paradiſe, and men had much better have kept out. And that they are much fitter to be quite cut off, than vigorouſly purſued, and ſeriouſly inſiſted on: may in part be gathered from hence. That they who labour moſt in them, get nothing by them. Their profit will not countervail their trouble: but Study here muſt be, what ſome Philoſophers thought Virtue was; a Reward to it ſelf. The Theoriſt has made himſelf a pregnant Inſtance to prove this. He has taken pains to find out what the Ancients determin'd concerning the *Seat* of the Terreſtial Paradiſe; but to how little purpoſe? For notwithſtanding that its *Place* was a *Real* Circumſtance (which his *Properties* of it were not;) he had no Requital for his Endeavours to diſcover it. The Search he made after it, was without Succeſs, and ſo without Satisfaction or Benefit. The 7th. Chapter of the ſecond Book of his *Engliſh Theory*, ſhows as much. There he informs us, that as for the *Jews* and *Hebrew* Doctors *they* place Paradiſe *under the Æquinoctial*. Where others of the Learned plac'd *the Ocean*, and where he himſelf places *the Fiery Zone*. He might have added, that their common Opinion was, that *GOD made Paradiſe* **before** *the World*: And when there was neither Heaven nor Earth in being, Where was the *Æquinoctial* to place it under? As for Ancient *Heathens*, *Poets*, and *Philoſophers*, they, he tells us, were *rather for* **ſeveral** *Paradiſes in the Earth*. As for *Chriſtian Fathers*, he ſays, they diſputed, whether Paradiſe was * *Corporeal*, or *Ambroſe*.

p. 253. p. 257. p. 253. p. 254.

* That Paradiſe was *Corporeal*, ſeems to be the conſtant Doctrine of all the Fathers except *Origen* (whom ſome count a Corrupter of the Scriptures ſimplicity) and St.

or *Intellectual* only, and *Allegorical*; *This was the* **grand point** *amongſt them*. And ſo they were like to make good work of the *place* of Paradiſe. And of thoſe of
Ib. and 255. them that *thought it* **local**, moſt *did not determine any thing concerning the* **particular** *place of it. But the reſt that did, expreſt themſelves in* **various ways**, *yet, upon a* **due interpretation**, they agree, *that* Paradiſe *was ſeated in the* **other** *Hemiſphere:* And having well
p. 260. obſerved, *their Ignorance of the Globe of the Earth* (which could not but betray them into falſe Notions about the Form of it, and about Places in it) at length
p. 262. he concludes thus. *Wherefore laying aſide all Natural Topicks, we are willing in this particular to refer our ſelves wholly to the report and majority of Votes amongſt the Ancients whether Chriſtians or others, who ſeem generally to incline to the South or South-Eaſt Land.* And ſo the place of Paradiſe is ſtill GOD knows where. Tho to bring it to *this*, even to the *South, or South-Eaſt Land*; he was fain to take pains, we ſee, and uſe ſome art. That is, in making a *due Interpretation* of thoſe Paſſages in the Ancients Writings, by which they *expreſt themſelves in* **various ways** touching this Matter. And all that he could get out of them at laſt, was but this neither; *Who* **ſeem** *generally to* **incline** *to the South or South-Eaſt Land.* And thoſe of the Fathers, who were *ignorant of the Globe of the Earth*, and *variouſly expreſſive* of themſelves in this point; ſo that their Expreſſions wanted a *due interpretation*, to make them ſpeak this *ſeeming Inclination* of theirs: were but a *few*: *The reſt*, as he calls them. A certain Remnant that did not diſpute whether Paradiſe were *intellectual*, &c. So that the Place of it, I ſay, is ſtill to ſeek: As much to ſeek as ever. And as for the Theoriſt, if he will but look impartially upon Particulars, and fairly caſt up what the whole amounts to; he may very juſtly for the Total Sum,

Sum of his Gains, ſet down a Cypher, at the Bottom of his Account. And truly it would be well if that were all. If he could croſs his Books, and make things ſo even; as after his Travels in this ſearch for Paradiſe to cry he is clear with all the World. But alas he muſt come to another Reckoning, and will find he came home a much worſe man, than he went out; as being deeply run in Debt in his Reputation. *We will never depend wholly upon their Credit, nor aſſert any thing upon the authority of the Ancients, which is not firſt proved by natural Reaſon, or warranted by Scripture.* A poſitive ingagement made, and public enough: but let us ſee how well he ſtood to it. Does *Reaſon* prove the place of Paradiſe to be in the other World? No. Does *Scripture* warrant it to be there? No. For he himſelf tells us expreſsly, neither **Scripture**, *nor* **Reaſon** *determine the Place of Paradiſe.* Yet notwithſtanding his Complement to both; he leaves them both, and *depends*, and depends *wholly* upon the *Credit* of the *Ancients* in this Point, and upon their *Authority*; as his own Words teſtify. For ſureneſs we will repeat them. *Wherefore laying aſide all natural Topics, we are willing in this Particular to refer our ſelves* **wholly** *to the* **report** *and* **majority of Votes** *among ſt the* **Ancients**, *whether Chriſtians or others, who ſeem generally to incline to the South, or South-Eaſt Land.* As if he had ſet up his Reſolution of adhering to *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, (as firm one would think) as a Rock; meerly to daſh his Credit in pieces againſt it. It was a very good *Declaration* which he made that way, and contains a *Rule* proper for him to go by. But it is as ſtrange that he ſhould break it ſo ſoon, and ſo plainly contradict that and himſelf. Eſpecially when he thus back'd and ſtrengthened it by what follows. *This Theory being chiefly Philoſophical,* **Reaſon** *is to be our* **firſt Guide**; *and where that falls ſhort, we may receive*

Eng. Theor. p. 4.

Anſw. p. 55.

Another Contradiction.

Eng. Theorp. 6.

receive further light and **confirmation** *from the* **ſacred Writings.**——But *as for* **Antiquity** *and the* **teſtimonies** *of the* **Ancients,** *we only make general Reflections upon them, for* **illuſtration** *rather than* **proof** *of what we propoſe.* Put this to what was declar'd before, and from both we learn this uſeful Leſſon. That in the Theory, not *any thing* is to be taken up upon the *Authority* of the *Ancients*, or to depend *wholly* upon their *Credit*; but it is *firſt* to be *proved* by *Reaſon*, or *warranted* by *Scripture*. *Natural Reaſon* is to be the Chief *Guide*, and *Confirmation* of what is propoſed muſt come from the *Sacred Writings*; and the *Teſtimonies* of the *Ancients* are for *illuſtration* rather than for *Proof*. But this being the declared Judgment of the Theoriſt, what means he ſo flatly to contradict it in his practice; by yielding Paradiſe was in the *Southern* Hemiſphere *wholly* upon the *Authority* of the *Ancients*; without either *natural Reaſon* to *prove it*, or *Scripture* to *warrant* and *confirm* it? And thereby indeed he contradicts Great *Moſes* too, as well as himſelf. For *his* inſpired Pen deſcribing that Garden, by the Rivers *Euphrates*, *Hiddekel*, *&c.* as principal Marks of its Situation; does place it originally in our *Northern* World.

Now had we not better *content our ſelves with a few* **Generals** *which every body knows*, that are certain; than go thus far, and pay thus dear, for ſingular Notions which are vain and void of truth? But if againſt the Divine Caveat from above, men will αὐθαδεύεσθαι, be wiſe in their own conceits; and without *Reaſon* to prove them, or *Scripture* to warrant them, will form Opinions to themſelves about ſacred Doctrines; or recommend them to others, even *againſt* Scripture: no wonder that their Studies ſhould tend to Vanity; and that their Diſquiſitions ſhould run out into wild Extravagance; and that having roiled the limpid Streams of Truth, they ſhould

ſhould drink in the muddy waters of Error, to quench their inordinate thirſt of knowledge.

This is ſpoken in remark of the *Nature* of thoſe Difficulties, which according to the Theory, attend the Doctrine of Paradiſe; and with *Baulking* of which we are charged by the Anſwer. The *place* of Paradiſe our Author makes to be the firſt of them, and he yields it to be in the *South-Eaſt-Land.* But then in yielding it there, by his own Confeſſion, he proceeds without Reaſon, and without Scripture. and we may add *againſt both*; inaſmuch as it is againſt Reaſon, for a Chriſtian Doctor to go againſt Scripture. Yet if the *place* of Paradiſe is ſuch an hidden, hamper'd, *difficult* Thing (as the Theoriſt makes it) which in it ſelf muſt needs be *real*, becauſe Paradiſe was *Local*: If that, I ſay, in the Circumſtance of its Situation, is ſo *difficult*, latent, and incertain; as to baffle his beſt Attempts of finding it, and render them inſignificant: What ſhall we think of the reſt of thoſe Difficulties, which he calls the *Properties* of Paradiſe? Surely they muſt be ſtrange and unreaſonable Things, to be appropriated to the true Doctrine of Paradiſe; as having nothing of that *certain Reality* in them, which the *place* of Paradiſe had; the meer Site of which prov'd ſo puzzling to him, as to defeat his Labours in ſearching after it, and make them vain and unhappy. And Theſe Difficulties being of this Quality; no *certain, Real* Things; no better than Chimærical Figments, or Romantick Forgeries; no other than fine and light Ideas, which float only in the Imaginations of the Phantſiful: Such things as GOD never put into the Doctrine of Paradiſe; Such as want Scripture to warrant them, Reaſon to prove them, and even ſo much as clear and ſound Authorities to vouch and recommend them; Such as yield no profit, but rather bring Prejudice to Doters upon

them, and writers about them; as we ſee by a fair Example before us. Theſe Difficulties, I ſay, being of this Strain; if we *had* baulked them, we might well have born the Cenſure of doing it, and as well have juſtifi'd the cenſured Action. But then they were not ſo *Baulked* neither, but that at the ſame time they were *confuted* alſo. For while our ſhort paraphraſe upon the holy Texts, relating to the Place of Paradiſe (and containing the Divine and only authentic Account thereof) lays down the *Generals* which *Scripture* affirms or teaches concerning it; it ſo far confutes the Theory's *Singularitys*, or Properties of it, as it ſhews, that (however they may be *Difficulties* indeed) they are no *real Parts* of the *true* and genuine Doctrine of Paradiſe. If they were, why do not the *ſacred writings* take *ſome* notice of them at leaſt? But they make not the *leaſt* mention of a *Perpetual Æquinox*, of a *perpetual Spring*, or of the Earth's *ſpontaneous Production of Animals*; which the Theory makes to be *Properties* of Paradiſe. Tho from hence we may conclude, that they are falſely ſo counted, they are falſely ſo called, becauſe the Scripture owns them not; nor are they conſentaneous to its Doctrine, either in themſelves, or in the train of their Conſequences. It approves of them no more, than it does of Paradiſe's *Præ-exiſtence* to the World; than it does of its Situation under the *Æquinoctial*; than it does of its being *placed* near to the *Moon*, or ſet up ſo *high*, as to be above *Darkneſs*, and out of the *reach* of the *Flood*. (Which made the Sons of Infallibility (a ſort of Theological Theoriſts) mount *Enoch* thither before the Deluge; whither after it, they ſent *Elias*, to keep him Company.) Theſe Conceits, in the Judgments of Some (both learned men and ancient Fathers) were *Properties* of Paradiſe. But for all that, they were meer empty Conceits ſtill, nor could they be other.

Yet

Yet let it be noted, they all ſtand in the ſame Rank, and are built on every whit as good Foundations, as the *Theory*'s Properties of Paradiſe are. For tho neither Reaſon nor Scripture do allow or confirm them; yet they are rear'd on expreſs *Authorities* of the *Ancients*, and ratifi'd by them. But are they of power to authenticate Phantſies, and turn them into Realities?

But to go on with this Point, upon which I little thought to have ſaid thus much. *Baulking* **all** *the Difficulties in the Doctrine of Paradiſe*; is *falſely* charged upon us. And that not only becauſe (as we have ſaid) theſe Difficulties are Shadows, Phantſies, and Falſhoods; And becauſe we have confuted them in a *general* way, by alledging and explaining the true Doctrine of Paradiſe delivered from above; which rather contradicts them, than gives countenance to them: But becauſe (as 'tis evident) we did **not** *baulk* **all** *thoſe Difficulties.* For the *Properties* of Paradiſe, that is to ſay, the *Perpetual Æquinox*, the *Longævity of the Antediluvians*, and the *Spontaneous or Vital Fertility of the Earth*, were at leaſt *ſome* of the Difficulties meant. Now to the *Firſt* of theſe we ſpake in the Eighth Chapter of our *Diſcourſe*, and ſo had no reaſon to return to it in the Thirteenth. And in the Thirteenth Chapter we handled the *other Two*; elſe what means the Anſwer given in to them here? Another Untruth.

But before we conſider the Anſwer he has made, there is one Objection to be removed, which he has thrown in our way. He tells the Animadverter, that *if he would undertake to confute the Theory in this Point, he ſhould have confuted* **four** *of his* **Particulars** concerning the Place of Paradiſe; *But he ſlips over theſe.* The Animadverter was to confute *this Aſſertion* of the Theory. *The Doctrine of Paradiſe cannot be underſtood, but upon ſuppoſition of the Primitive Earth and its Properties.* *Anſw. p. 55.*

Now if he could make it out, that the Doctrine of Paradiſe is *intelligible* **without** the Theory; as intelligible *without* it, as it is *with* it; this Aſſertion muſt needs be confuted. This therefore he undertook to do. And it being done, what he intended, and what he was obliged to, was performed. And even theſe *particular Objections* too, tho before not ſo *diſtinctly* made: were *virtually* anſwered, and confuted in the *Subſtance* of them. But however it being expected we ſhould do it, let us ſpeak more expreſsly to theſe *Four Particulars.*

Anſw. p. 55: The Firſt is this. *The Place of Paradiſe cannot be determin'd by Scripture only.* Firſt, if it cannot be determin'd by Scripture *only*, it muſt be determin'd by Scripture *chiefly*. For that alone gives the beſt grounds whereon, and the beſt light whereby to deſcribe the Place, ſo far as it can be done. And ſecondly, it is not to be doubted, but that at firſt it did *more exactly* define or bound it out: only ſince that time, ſuch changes have happened to the Chanels of Rivers, and the Boundaries of it; as render the Draught or Deſcription of the Country, which was then more exact and clear; dark now and inſufficient. And Scripture having deſcribed Paradiſe ſo well at firſt, and contributing ſo peculiarly to the beſt poſſible deſcription of it ſtill; it is that which *did* determine it *only*, in a more ſatisfactory meaſure, once; and that which *does* determine it *only*, in a well qualifi'd ſenſe, to this day; ſo far, that is, as it is determinable. And what can be expected from it more?

The Second is this. *The place of Paradiſe cannot be determin'd by the Theory.* And how ſhould it, when GOD ſignifies it (as we ſhall ſee immediately) to be ſeated in *one* Hemiſphere, and *that* fixes it in the *other*? But is it not pretty then, that the Animadverter, if he would confute the Theory, ſhould be put to confute this Particular? That is, he muſt prove the Theory

can

can do, what it *cannot* do. A notable way of ſecuring an Hypotheſis; to tie him who attaques it, to do a thing that is impoſſible, whereby to overthrow it.

The Third is this. *If we appeal to Antiquity in this caſe, we ſhall find that it* (Paradiſe) *was not in* Meſopotamia. But according to his own Rule, *Antiquity* without *Reaſon* and *Scripture* to back it, is not to be *depended* on. And for the ſame reaſon, his *Fourth Particular* falls of it ſelf; which is this, *According to the plurality of Votes, both amongſt the Heathen and Chriſtian Authors, it was plac'd in the other Hemiſphere.* But theſe Heathen and Chriſtian Authors, having neither Reaſon nor Scripture to ſecond what they ſay; (again we repeat it) they are not to be *depended* on: nor can the Anſwerer, if he ſtands to his word, aſſert Paradiſe to have been where they place it, upon their *credit* or *authority.* But we have ſomething elſe to offer, which will reach *both* the Particulars at once. The Beſt Antiquity in the whole World, is *Scripture.* And if we appeal to that, we ſhall find it moſt probable, that the ſeat of Paradiſe was *Meſopotamia*, or ſome Region thereabouts; by the ſeveral broad Signs which it gives us thereof, in the Second Chapter of *Geneſis.* For

Firſt, That is *Eaſtward* of the place where *Moſes* wrote. And it is ſaid, *Gen.* 2. 8. that *the* LORD *GOD planted a Garden* **Eaſtward**. And whereas our Author would have *Mikkedhem* there, to ſignify, *in the beginning*; *Moſes* teaches us plainly that it ſignifies, *in the Eaſt*, by uſing the word in that ſenſe himſelf, in the very next Chapter. For in the laſt Verſe of it, he ſays, that GOD *placed Cherubim and a flaming Sword,* מקדם לגן-עדן *in the* **Eaſt** *of the Garden of* Eden. But to have rendred it thus, *he placed* **in the Beginning** *of the Garden of* Eden, *Cherubim and a flaming Sword*; would have been a very improper and ill Reddition. And as

Eng. Theor. p. 251.

often

often as מקדם,קדמה,קדם do occur in the *Pentateuch*, which I think, is at leaſt thirty times, beſides *Gen.* 2. 8. I do not find that they can, in any *one* place, be rendred otherwiſe than, *Eaſt*, *Eaſtward*, *of the Eaſt*, or *in the Eaſt*. Which if they cannot, it is enough to convince us, that *Mikkedhem*, *Gen.* 2. 8. muſt be rendred, *in the Eaſt*; not, *in the Beginning*.

Secondly, *Eden* is there; the Country wherein Paradiſe was planted. So we read again, *Gen.* 2. 8. that *the LORD GOD planted a Garden Eaſtward in EDEN*. And tho *He* would have *Eden* ſignify, *pleaſure*, and ſo read the Text thus; *the LORD GOD planted a Garden* in pleaſure: that cannot be the true meaning. For the word is בעדן, and ſo it muſt be read, *the LORD GOD planted a Garden* in pleaſure; which would ſound but harſhly. And in the next Verſe but one, it is ſaid, that *a River went out of* Eden *to water the Garden*. But to ſay a River went out of *pleaſure* to water the Garden; would be no good ſenſe. And in the fourth of *Geneſis* we meet with a Paſſage, which ſhows that *Moſes*, by *Mikkedhem*, muſt mean *the Eaſt*, and not *the Beginning*; and by *Eden*, a *Country*, and not *pleaſure*. For telling us there at the 16th. Verſe, which way the Land of *Nod* lay, where *Cain* dwelt; he ſays, it was *on the Eaſt of Eden*. But for him to have ſaid, it was *in the beginning of Pleaſure*; would have been an odd account of its Situation. After all which (if it will not ſeem ſuperfluous) may be added the words ſpoken by *Rabſhakeh* in the perſon of his Maſter, and recorded by the Prophet, *Jer.* 37. 12. *Have the GODS of the Nations delivered them which my Fathers have deſtroyed, as* Gozan, *and* Haran, *and* Rezeph, *and the Children of* Eden *which were in* Talaſſar? *Ezekiel* alſo puts *Haran*, and *Canneh*, and *Eden* together. Whence it plainly appears, that *Eden* was as much the proper name

Ibid.

Ch. 27. *v.* 23.

name of a place, as *Rezeph*, or *Canneh*, or any of thoſe mention'd. And alſo that that place was in the Eaſtern part of our Continent; becauſe the other places or Regions here joined with it, lay about it, or bordered upon it. And ſo it might be in *Meſopotamia* too; tho it could not be in the Southern Hemiſphere. And it is obſervable that when *Jacob* journied to *Haran* in *Meſopotamia*; he is ſaid to come *into the land of the Children of* the East, Gen. 29. 1. And *Balaam* who was *brought out of the Mountains of* the East, *Numb.* 23. 7; is ſaid to be of *Meſopotamia*, *Deut.* 23. 4.

Thirdly, the Land of *Havilah* is there; about which the River *Piſon* is ſaid to fetch a compaſs, *Gen.* 2. 11. Not the *Indian Havilah* (as ſome have greatly miſtaken: and by that miſtake have been led into another, that *Piſon* was *Ganges*:) but that *Havilah* which was ſo called from the Son of *Cuſh*. Whereas the other *Havilah* took its denomination from the Son of *Joctan*. *Strabo* alſo placeth the *Havilah* that relates to Paradiſe, in the Confines of *Arabia* and *Meſopotamia*.

Fourthly, the Land of *Cuſh* is there; ſo denominated from *Cuſh* the Son of *Ham*, who ſettled himſelf and his Family in it. It is ſaid to be compaſſed with the River *Gihon*, *Gen.* 2. 13. and it is the *Aſiatic Æthiopia*. Tho ſome preſuming that the *African Æthiopia* was there meant, concluded that *Gihon* muſt be the *Nile*.

Fifthly, *Hiddekel* or *Tigris* is there; which is ſaid to run towards the Eaſt of *Aſſyria*, *Gen.* 2. 14. Upon whoſe Stream riſing from the *Gordian* Mountains in the greater *Armenia*, and flowing Southwards to the dividing of *Meſopotamia* from *Aſſyria*; ſtands the Principal City of that Country, the famous *Ninive*, built by *Aſſur*.

Sixthly, *Euphrates*, that Celebrated River of *Aſia*, is there alſo, *Gen.* 2. 14. I mean in that Eaſtern part of our Continent.

Now

Now are not all theſe Regions and Rivers, in, or about *Eden*, or *Meſopotamia*? And are they not Marks of the Earthly Paradiſe? And were they not made ſo by *Moſes* himſelf? And was not he directed by the H. GHOST? And might it not be in *Meſopotamia* then, or muſt it not be near it? For had it been out of it, and remote from it; what wiſe man inſpired by GOD, would have deſcribed it by ſuch Rivers, and deſcrib'd it by ſuch Regions as lay about *Meſopotamia*, and were conterminous with it, or bordering upon it? and if ſome of theſe Rivers, and ſome of theſe Regions, be very much chang'd in their Names and Poſtures, ſince *Moſes* wrote; that's no marvel. It would rather be a wonder (conſidering * the Mutability of Nature here below) if in ſo long a time they were not greatly altered. Tho theſe Alterations do not argue in the leaſt, that Paradiſe was not ſituate in *Meſopotamia*, or ſome adjacent Region. Where after ſo many thouſands of years, we are no more to look for the ſame Features in the Earth's Face, than for the ſame Fruitfulneſs in its Soil. Tho if we will believe *Herodotus*, *Strabo*, and *Q. Curtius*; the *Babylonian* Soil does ſtill retain a ſtrange and happy Fertility. For they aſſure us, that it yields Corn at the rate of two hundred fold; and that it bears Palm Trees of its own accord; which afford Bread, Wine, Honey, &c. And as *Pliny* informs us, their Corn grows ſo rank, that men are fain to cut it twice, and after that, turn Sheep into it to eat it down. And then Crops are ſo plentiful, that one year, they ſow themſelves againſt the

* *Certum eſt inſignes variationes in terræ partibus continuo evenire, propter bellorum incurſiones; aquarum inundationes; Marium præruptiones ac receſſus; imperiorum, regnorum, & dominiorum inſtabilitates. Etenim non ſolum regiones, urbes, oppida, flumina, & alia hujuſmodi ſua nomina pro tempore mutant, amiſſis prorſus prioribus, verum etiam & fines ipſarum regionum variantur, & urbes, oppidaq; ſenectute deleatur, bellorum calamitate everſuntur, aliaq; de novo conduntur, & mare uno in loco continentem terræ dilatat, in alio coarctat, & flumina quandoq; augeſcunt, quandoq; minuuntur, quandoq; curſus variant, quandoq; etiam prorſus, deficiunt. Sic quoque, fontes, ſtagna, paludes alibi exiccantur, alibi vero procreantur,* &c. Magin. *in præf. ad Geogr.*

Clia. l. 1. *Geog. l.* 16.

Nat. Hiſt. l. 18. *c.* 17.

next; and *ſponte reſtibilis ſit ſeges*, Corn grows of its own accord, and yields an harveſt without Tillage. And if this Soil be ſo fertile now; what was it before the Curſe, when it was newly created, and in its prime Perfection?

So that upon the whole Matter, let Rabbies, and Fathers, and Poets, and Theoriſts ſay what they pleaſe; yet ſo long as *Moſes* wrote the ſecond Chapter of *Geneſis*, and his hand was guided by the moſt HOLY and unerring SPIRIT; we cannot but think, that men in reaſon ought to conclude, and that in duty they ought to believe, that Paradiſe was ſeated in *Meſopotamia*, or thereabouts. And we hope it is as *intelligible* that it ſhould be *there* ſeated, as that it was ſituate in the *Southern Hemiſphere*. For who ever yet underſtood, or who *can* underſtand; That *Eden*, and *Havilah*, and *Cuſh*, and *Aſſyria*, were Countries; and that *Piſon*, and *Gihon*, and *Hiddekel*, and *Euphrates*, were Rivers, in that Southern Hemiſphere? In caſe they were ſo, how came they from thence hither? I remember Sir *Richard Baker* tells it, as a great Wonder, amongſt the Caſualties that hapned in our Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; that a certain hill in *Herefordſhire*, beginning to remove out of its place, on *Saturday* Evening, continued walking till *Munday* noon. But if ſuch large Countries as theſe, could take ſo long a Journey; the ambulatory Mount may ſtand by for a diminutive Prodigy.

Tho we muſt obſerve withal, that the Fathers never ſeated Paradiſe in *the other Hemiſphere* neither. They only **ſeem** to **incline** to that, by the Theoriſts **due interpretation** of them, as was noted above. And as to the Seat of Paradiſe (as he ſays) they *expreſſed themſelves* in **various ways**. That is, their Notions of it were incertain; and in plain terms, they knew not where to fix it. But ſo far were they from believing it

to be in the Southern Hemiſphere, that they did not believe *that* Hemiſphere was ever *inhabited*; for they did not believe that there were *Antipodes*. And when ſome of them would have Paradiſe to be *Myſtical* only; and others would have it to be the *whole Earth*; and others place it under the *Æquinoctial*; and others under the *Globe* or *Circle of the Moon*; and others in the *exterior part* of a *flat* or plain Earth, round the inward part of which, they ſuppoſed the Ocean to ſtand like a Ring: Which of them ſet it in the *Southern Hemiſphere*? Tho if they had, we need not have been much ſurpriz'd at it neither. For being but men, they might have done as men; have erred, that is, in their Opinion. And truly ever ſince *Adam*, through deſire of Knowledge, firſt planted error in Paradiſe; that poyſonous Weed has been apt to Spring up and ſpread unhappily in other places, and the beſt Gardens of Antiquity have been ſtained with it. Witneſs the *Millenium*; the *Rebaptizing of Hæretics*; the *Limbus Patrum*; the *Communicating of Infants*; and the like. And if we'll take in Errors of a lower Strain, we ſhall find the falſe Notions entertained by the Ancients, of the *Form of the Earth*, of the *Figure* and *Situation of the Sea*, of the *non-exiſtence of Antipodes*, &c. ready to confirm and corroborate the Teſtimony. And what does the famous *Ariſtotelian* Hypotheſis ſeem to be now in this preſent Age, but a Maſs of Errors? Where ſuch a Syſteme was contrived for the Heavens, and ſuch a ſituation aſſigned to the Earth; as neither Reaſon can approve, nor Nature allow. Yet ſo proſperous and prevailing was this Hypotheſis, that it was generally received and ſucceſsfully

Ariſtotle believed the *Milky Way* to be a *Meteor*. He alſo allowed but *Eight* Heavenly Sphæres; which *Timocaris*, above three hundred years before the Incarnation, improved to *Nine*; and *Alphonſus* (in the thirteenth Century after it) into *Ten*; and afterward they were commonly reckoned *Eleven*. And not only *Egyptians*, *Græcians*, and *Arabians*, but even *Hebrew* and *Chriſtian* Doctors, took the Stars to be *living Bodies* actuated with *Souls*; as *Eſpencæus* informs us in his Treatiſe *de Cal. animat.*

fully propagated for many Ages. And when the Heavens were ſo miſconceived, and the Earth ſo miſplaced; and the Errors touching both, were ſpread ſo far, and continued ſo long: why might not the ſame happen as to Paradiſe? Why might not the *Ancients*, and the choiceſt of the Ancients miſtake concerning it, particularly concerning the *place* of it?

Were an Account to be given of the Original or Occaſion of this their Miſtake; it might ſeem methinks to have riſen thus, or proceeded from hence. They thought and ſpake *too Great things* of Paradiſe, and ſuppoſed ſuch Properties and Excellencies in it, as it never had, nor was capable of. And having rais'd their Phantſies to ſo high a Pitch, they could not tell how to let them fall again, and ſtoop ſo low as *Meſopotamia*. And ſo they conceited that Paradiſe was in ſome remote, unknown, inacceſſible Region, or as it were in another World, becauſe they could find out no place in this, which anſwered the gay Notions that they had, and their fine but falſe Idea's of it. Juſt as the *Jews* overlookt the Perſon of the true *Meſſiah*, becauſe it came not up to that vain and extravagant Character of Him, unhappily imprinted on their Minds: So theſe pious, learned, and incomparable men, took no notice of the real Place of Paradiſe, as being prepoſſeſt with miſapprehenſions of it. The loſty Opinions which they had concerning it, lifted up their Thoughts far above it, and carry'd them away quite beyond it. They imagin'd that it was they knew not well what, and ſo they placed it they knew not well where; believing they ſhould wrong it, if they fixt it any where in this ordinary World.

The Excepter having done with the *Place* of Paradiſe; he objected next againſt the *Longævity* of men before the flood, as a *Property* of it. *But this*, ſays[f. 55.]

the Anſwerer, *he handles ſo looſely, that in the concluſion of his Diſcourſe, one cannot tell whether he affirms it or denies it.* The Excepter begins his diſcourſe of this matter, with theſe very words. *As for the Longævity of the Antediluvians, that could be* no *Property or Adjunct of Paradiſe.* And did he not *deny* then, and *poſitively* deny the Longævity of the Antediluvians, *as a Property of Paradiſe*, which is his notion of it? And becauſe the Anſwerer does affirm the thing, by dividing the *Doctrine* of the *local* Paradiſe into *two parts*, the *Place*, and the *Properties* of it, and making this Antediluvian Longevity *one* of thoſe Properties: the Replicant continues the poſitive Negation, and ſays expreſſly as before, that the Longævity of the Antediluvians could be *no Property* of Paradiſe. He makes it good thus. If it had been ſo, it would have ceaſed, or have been extinguiſht in Mankind, by their loſs of that Place. For where-ever Priviledges are the Properties of a Place, he that enjoys them, can hold them no longer than he continues in that place. If once he forfeits the Place, and be diſpoſſeſs'd of that; together with it, he muſt actually loſe all thoſe Priviledges which are Properties of it, and be deprived of them. And this Longævity being (according to our Author) a Property of the *Place* of Paradiſe; *Adam* and his Children could not be priviledg'd with it as ſuch, when he himſelf was ſoon turn'd out of it, and none of *them* were ever in it. Beſides, how could this Longævity be a *Property* of the Particular *Topical* Paradiſe; when he makes it to be *one* of his three *general* Characters, *common* to the *whole* Primitive Earth? Yet a Property of the particular Paradiſe it muſt needs be, becauſe it is *one* of the Properties meant, where he divides the *Doctrine* of that Paradiſe, into the *Place*, and the *Properties* of that Place. But then is not here ſomething like *Contradi-*

Diſc. p. 273.

Anſwer. p. 55.

Eng. Theor. l. 2. *c.* 2, 3.

ction

ction again, where a Property of *one particular Place* of the Earth, is made *common* to the *whole* habitable Earth?

Indeed the Excepter did not *positively* deny the Longævity of the *Antediluvians* to be *General*. And therefore the Answerer taxes him with *Sceptical humour*. But if the contrary humour will please him better, the Replicant will so far put it on, as *positively* to affirm that the Prædiluvian Longævity cannot be founded upon the Hypothesis of the Theory. For in case it stands upon that foundation, it must be supported by a constant Æquinox and an Oval Earth. And that Earth must be without Metals and without a Sea. And then as *Adam* could have no Dominion over the Fish; so neither could *Tubal-Cain* trade in Brass or Iron. And if these things were thus, plain Scripture must be false, and *Moses* must be out in the history of the Creation. *He* was deceiv'd, that is, that *we* might be so; and the SPIRIT of Truth which actuated *him*, is become the Author of Lies to *us*; which GOD forbid any one should think. *Answ. p. 55.*

After this he observes, that the Excepter did not *take notice of the two last Reasons* he gave, in confirmation of the Antediluvian Longævity. One of them runs thus. *The generations recorded in Scripture after the Flood, as they exceed the term of succeeding Ages, so they decline by degrees from the Antediluvian Longævity.* To this we answered sufficiently, (tho we did not expressly apply it to that particular Reason) where we said, *Shem, Arphaxad, Salah*, and *Eber*, living much longer just after the Flood, than others did *then*, or have done *since*; did live so long for the *same reasons* that the *ten* men in a lineal descent *Gen.* 5. were such long-livers. For so their lives are not to be lookt upon as *declining* from the Antediluvian Longævity, as the Answerer conceits; but as *extraordinarily lengthened*, by *ib. p. 56.* See *Disc. p. 274.*

a

a ſpecial Bleſſing; the elongation of them being a work of *Providence*, not of *Nature*.

Anſw. p. 56. The other Reaſon was this. Jacob *complains of the ſhortneſs of his life, and fewneſs of his days, in compariſon of his Forefathers, when he had liv'd one hundred and thirty years; which had been a groundleſs complaint, if his Anceſtors had not lived much longer.* The Anſwer to this is ſo obvious and eaſy, that it was not worth troubling the Reader with it. *The days of the years of my Pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my Life been, and have not attained to the days of the years of the life of my Fathers*: So *Jacob* complained, *Gen.* 47. 9. Now his days being ſpent, or ſo far paſt, they could not but ſeem *few* to the good Patriarch, tho they were an hundred and thirty years. And being no more, he might truly ſay, that they had *not attain'd* to the years of his Fathers; without any manner of reference *to*, or ſo much as thought *of*, the Antediluvian long-livers. For *Gen.* 11. 32. his Great-Grandfather *Terah* lived two hundred and five years. His Grandfather *Abraham*, an hundred *C.* 25. 7. and threeſcore and fifteen. And his Father *Iſaac*, an *C.* 35. 28. hundred and fourſcore. So that the ſhorteſt liver of theſe his Anceſtors lived *much longer* than he had then done: even by more than a Third part of his Time mentioned.

That thoſe remembred by *Moſes* as Long-livers before the Flood, do not ſhow *all* in general to be ſo; *Diſc. p.* 277. the Excepter argued from theſe words of his: *There* *Gen.* 6. 4. *were Giants on the Earth in thoſe days.* Now as his telling the World, there were ſome Giants then, does not imply that the whole Race of Mankind were ſuch; but does rather import that the reſt were otherwiſe: ſo his mentioning ſome ſo very Long-livers, may inſinuate that the reſt were not ſo. To this it is anſwered;

there

there had been ſome pretence for this, if Moſes *had made a diſtinction of two races of men in the firſt World: Long-livers and Short-livers; as he hath diſtinguiſht the Giants from the Common race of Mankind.* And is not his Diſtinction *equally* plain in *both* caſes? Or if there be any difference, does he not diſtinguiſh *better* betwixt long-livers and ſhort-livers; than he does betwixt men of Gigantic, and of uſual Proportions? For whereas to diſtinguiſh Giants from ordinary men, he only ſaid, *there were Giants on the Earth in thoſe days*; he did *more* than ſay there were Long-livers on the Earth in thoſe days: for he ſpecifi'd their *Names*, and he ſet down their *Ages*, ſignifying clearly both *who* they were, and to *what years* they reached. But on the other ſide, he neither expreſſed who the Giants were, nor what their Stature and Dimenſions. So that of the two, he diſtinguiſhes more plainly betwixt long-livers and ſhort-livers; than betwixt the Giants and men of common ſize. For thus indeed he fairly intimated that the *Generality* of the prædiluvians were *ſhort livers*, by his care to *particularize* thoſe that liv'd *long*; and both by their *names*, and by the *length* of their days, to *diſcriminate* them from the reſt. And tho the Anſwerer ſays, in the cloſe of his Paragraph, that *not to ſuppoſe* long life *general to Mankind at that time, is a groundleſs reſtriction, which is neither founded upon Scripture nor reaſon:* We reply, that it may be *founded upon* **both**. For *Scripture* ſays, *in the day that thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely dye, Gen.* 2. 17. And tho this Sentence was denounc'd againſt man conditionally at firſt, in caſe he ſinned; yet upon his actual diſobedience, it became poſitive as it were, and abſolute. And when Scripture makes this the Sentence of GOD; (Who had ſufficient power to execute it, as well as juſt and mighty provocation to do it:) after once

Anſw. p. 57.

once it took place, it muſt be conſonant to *Reaſon*, that ſhort life rather than long life, ſhould be the general lot of men. And ſo both *Scripture* and *Reaſon* plainly ſuggeſt, that they who lived eight or nine hundred years, under this Sentence, muſt in all likelihood ow their Longævity to the favour of Heaven, and a ſpecial Benediction; rather than to the ſtrength of their own nature within, or any Courſe or Order of Nature without. Eſpecially if we conſider, that even the pretended Æquinoctial State of Nature, would
See *Diſc.* p. 281. have ſhortned mens days, as we noted. And if that *alone* would have hindred Longævity: how much more would it have done it, when the *ſin* of man concurred with it; and the *curſe* of GOD upon the Earth, occaſion'd by that ſin?

As to the Teſtimonies of the Ancients cited by *Joſephus*, and alledged by the Theoriſt in proof of the
Eng. Theor. p. 315. Antediluvian Longævity; they were noted by the Excepter to be *utterly falſe*.
Diſc. p. 276. For whereas they witneſs that in the firſt age of the World, men liv'd a *thouſand* years; none of mankind, according to the account that the Divine Writings give, ever did ſo: but ſome of them (tho this is anſwered by his *laſt Expedient* only) fell very ſhort of it. Thus, *Seth* came ſhort of a thouſand years, by almoſt Ninety; *Enos*, by almoſt an Hundred; *Mahalaleel*, by above an Hundred; *Lamech*, by above two Hundred and Twenty. The Anſwerer therefore need not have inſiſted upon the Ancients Tradition. And tho he tells the Excepter that *he ſeems*
Anſw. p. 57. *content, this Tradition ſhould be admitted*: Yet as
Diſc. p. 278. the Context plainly ſhows, he *yielded it* only ſo far, as to make the Conceſſion *introductive* to an Enquiry after farther Tradition, about a *conſtant Equinox* and *Perpetual* Spring; how it comes to paſs that Tradition is ſo partial, as not to tell us explicitly of *them*, the Cauſes

of

of this Longævity? But *this Queſtion*, he ſays, *is fully anſwered, and the Tradition fully made out before, in the 8th. Chapter.* And to that 8th Chapter of his Anſwer, the 8th Chapter here does as fully Reply. But let us go on to the *Reaſons* alledg'd againſt the General Longævity of the Prædiluvians.

The Firſt was this. Their Multitudes would have overſtockt the Earth. To which he anſwers, That *Earth was more capacious than* this *is, where the Sea takes away half of its Surface.* But as the Sea takes away from *this* Earth, ſo the Torrid Zone and Rainy Regions took away from *that*. *That* Earth alſo had no Mountains, which in this are great as well as numerous; and do very much inlarge its Capacity or room for Inhabitants. And whereas he ſuggeſts, that Mountains are *leſs habitable* than Plains, *by reaſon of their barrenneſs*: It muſt be conſidered firſt, that a Mountainous Earth muſt have Valleys in it. And as Mountains are more barren than Plains, ſo Valleys are oftentimes more fruitful than they; and alſo receptive of more Dwellers. That is, by reaſon of their hollowneſs and declivities, they are more capacious than Plains, whoſe ſuperficial extent is equal to the tops of theſe Valleys, if meaſured by lines drawn from ſide to ſide. Secondly, tho ſome Mountains be barren, others are as fruitful. *Taurus*, for inſtance, which takes its Denomination, as ſome think, from its Magnitude; and is the Greateſt Mountain in all *Aſia* (being as we are told, fifty Miles broad in ſome places on the Top of it, and fifteen hundred long, reaching from the Ocean of *Chinah*, to the Sea of *Pamphylia*;) on the ſides of it is prodigious fruitful, tho its higheſt parts are covered with Snow. For it affords Honey, Wheat, Gums, Wines, and Fruits in vaſt Quantities. What he intimates touching *Holland*, that there are more peo-

Diſc. p. 279. Anſw. p. 58.

Ib.

Ibid. ple in it, *than upon a like number of Acres upon the* Alps *or* Pyreneans; is allowed to be true. But then the Populouſneſs of that Place (as of many others) is not owing to the Fruitfulneſs of the Soil, but to the Traffique by Sea. And therefore he had the leſs reaſon to accuſe the Sea of ſtraightning the Earth; when by vertue of its Trade, it inables ſo great a multitude of *Anſw. p. 58.* People, to live in ſo little a compaſs of Ground. Here he adds, that he has *Two things to complain of as foul play*; *Citing* the Theory *partially*; and not *marking the place* whence the Citation was taken. As to this *Latter*, it was not ſo needful to mark the *place* of the Citation, becauſe the place of *another* Citation immediately before this, and relating to the ſame matter, *See Diſc. p. 279.* was marked: And *this* Citation here meant, was but *ſix lines* diſtant from that, on the very next page. As to the *Former*, He had no cauſe to blame the Excepter for a *Partial Citation*; for he cited enough to confute the Theory fairly, as to this Point, out of it ſelf; and what needed he to cite more? The Citation was this. *Ib. 279, 280. If we allow the firſt Couple, at the end of one hundred years, or of the firſt Century, to have left ten pair of breeders, which is an eaſy ſuppoſition, there would ariſe from theſe in fifteen hundred years, a greater number than the Earth was capable of, allowing every pair to multiply in the ſame decuple proportion the firſt pair did.* So that admitting this *eaſy Suppoſition*, either the Longævity of the Antediluvians muſt not be *univerſal*, or the Earth was *incapable* of its Inhabitants, ſaid the Excepter. But *therefore*, ſays the Anſwerer, *the Theoriſt tells you,* **the ſame meaſure cannot run equally through all Ages.** *Anſw. p. 58, 59.* *And in his calculation you ſee, after the firſt Century, he hath taken only a* **quadruple proportion for the increaſe of mankind.** *This the Excepter might have obſerved.* And this the Excepter *did* obſerve. But then he obſerved

ſerved withal, that he had *no reaſon* to go off from this *eaſy ſuppoſition* of a *decuple* proportion. And therefore he ſtopt at it, and did not concern himſelf with the *Quadruple proportion*, as being a *groundleſs* diminution of that Decuple Meaſure of increaſe, which would have eaſily held on through all following Centuries, in a proportion equal to that of the firſt. For if *Adam* and *Eve*, the firſt pair of Breeders at the end of the firſt Century, left *ten* pair; why ſhould not every other pair be allow'd to multiply at the ſame rate? The reaſon given ſeems to be this. *This is an* **eaſy ſuppoſition** *for the* **firſt century**, *but it would be a* **very uneaſy** *one for the* **following Centuries**. And why? I find no reaſon again but this: *becauſe this* (decuple proportion) *would riſe far beyond the capacities of this Earth.* That is, it would not be *uneaſy* in the *truth* and *reality* of the thing; but uneaſy in regard of the Theory's *Hypotheſis*. It would not be uneaſy for Mankind to *multiply* in a *decuple* proportion; but it would be uneaſy for the Theory to *allow* they did ſo; becauſe then, as the Excepter urges, the Earth would have been *overcharg'd* with their numerous increaſe. And when the Excepter cited ſo much of the Theory, as carried the whole Truth of the Matter in it; he had no reaſon to go farther in citing more of it, which was added but to ſerve the Theory *againſt* the Truth: nor is there reaſon why he ſhould be counted or called *partial*, becauſe he did not do it. That every Pair of breeders ſhould at the end of every Century leave ten pair more; is eaſy and allowable, becauſe, in all likelihood, true in it ſelf: and was the Excepter to take in a lower proportion, becauſe this higher one was not for the Theoriſt's purpoſe? The firſt Suppoſition being eaſy, and in all probability true; why ſhould a ſecond be admitted, to render that uneaſy and falſe,

Ib. p. 58.

Eng. The. p. 23.

meerly becauſe it favours not him who made it? But let him ſhow why *Seth* and his Wife, and *Enos* and his Wife, and other pairs downward, may not be allowed to multiply in the ſame decuple proportion that the firſt pair are allowed to do; and then the Excepter will own himſelf faulty for not enlarging the Citation, and taking in the Quadruple proportion mentioned. But becauſe in all probability, they multipli'd in equal meaſures; he had no reaſon to be blam'd as partial, for leaving it out. Tho the truth is, if but the *Quadruple* proportion be admitted, it will ſet the Number of the Prædiluvians very much too high, if compar'd with the Number of the preſent Earth's Inhabitants; as the Theoriſt computes them both. For whereas he thinks that *the preſent number of men upon the face of the Earth, is commonly eſtimated to be betwixt three and four hundred Millions*: the Quadruple proportion, in ſixteen hundred and fifty years (which paſſed before the Flood came in) would raiſe it to 21474836480. A moſt prodigious Exceſs: as raiſing the number more than one and twenty thouſand Millions above the common account. Or if we quite lay aſide this *Quadruple* proportion, and go but according to that *other Citation* out of the Theory before this; the Earth would *ſtill* be overlaid with the multitude of its Inhabitants. The Citation runs thus. *'Tis likely they were more fruitful in the firſt Ages of the World, than after the Flood; and they lived ſix, ſeven, eight, nine hundred years apiece, getting Sons and Daughters.* And when men lived ſo many hundreds of years before the Flood, and lived getting of Sons and Daughters, and were *more* fruitful, *then*, than ſince; how is it poſſible but that the firſt Earth in ſixteen hundred years, muſt be mightily overpeopled; eſpecially when *Digamy*, and (as the H. GHOST ſeems to intimate) *Poligamy* too, were in faſhion

Eng Theor. p. 23.

See Diſc. p. 279.

Gen. 6. 2.

faſhion in the firſt World? So that go which way you pleaſe; by your *Decuple*, that is, or by your *Quadruple* proportion, or elſe by the *laſt clauſe* cited out of your Theory; and according to any, or according to all of them, the primitive Earth would have been greatly overſtockt, in caſe the Longævity of the Antediluvians had been univerſal.

The ſecond Reaſon againſt that Longævity was the *inequality* of it; or the *difference* as to length of days, amongſt them that lived before the Flood. To this it is anſwered, *their* Stamina *and Conſtitutions might then be of a different ſtrength, as well as now.* The length of Mens days depends naturally upon the ſtrength of their Bodies; and the ſtrength of their Bodies, upon the goodneſs of their *Stamina*, and Conſtitutions. And therefore if Theſe were as *different* before the Flood, as they are ſince; many Millions might dye then as ſoon as they were born, and as many in their Infancy, and as many very young, and ſo the Longævity of the Prædiluvians could not be *General*: which was the Thing objected.

Diſc. p. 280. *Anſw. p. 59.*

The laſt Reaſon againſt the Prædiluvian Longævity ſuppoſed to proceed from a conſtant Equinox; was the proportionable *long life* of other Animals. For that would have been an Effect of the ſame Cauſe. And they multiplying much faſter than Mankind; had they lived long, they would have grown ſo numerous as to have been pernicious. To which it is anſwered thus. *I can ſay nothing to that, nor he neither upon good grounds, unleſs we knew what ſpecies's of Animals were then made, and in what degrees they Multiplied.* He formerly yielded, that *the Earth then brought forth the principles of life, and* **all living Creatures**, *Man excepted*: But now it appears that he then ſaid he *knew not what*; for he owns that he *knows not* what ſpecies's of Animals were then made.

Anſw. p. 59. *Diſc. p. 281, 282, 283.* The ſecond Character is the Longævity of men; and, as is probable, of *all other Animals in proportion.* *Eng. Theor. p. 180.* *Eng. The p. 179.*

And

And then as to the *Degrees* which they multiply'd in, they muſt needs be ſtrangely high. For beſides that the Ground was then moſt fat and fruitful, and the Air moſt warm and cheriſhing, and all advantages imaginable concurr'd to conſtant and numerous propagations of them; the *Earth* brought forth the *principles of life*, we ſee, and *all living creatures*: and ſo by *ſpontaneous* Births they would have increaſed even *ſans number*; and ſuch a conſuming multitude of them would have been produced, as would not only have greatly annoyed, but utterly ruined Mankind. For while Horſes, Aſſes, Cows, Sheep, Goats, Swine, Dogs, Lions, Bears, Wolves, Crocodiles, Serpents, Scorpions, Rats, Mice, Fowls, Hornets, *&c.* grew out of the Earth in ſtrange plenty; and this Terrigenous Breed (by the help and influence of a perpetual Equinox) were naturally far more prolific than now theſe Creatures are, and there were no hands to hinder their Procreations, or to deſtroy either young or old: how could Mankind who multiply'd (in compariſon) ſo very ſlowly, have defended either themſelves or their Proviſions (naked and deſtitute of Weapons as they were) from the Aſſaults and Invaſions of ſuch inconceiveable Herds or Swarms of Vermin, as would have come upon them? But here therefore the old Expedient, *Extraordinary Providence*, is call'd in again for
ib. Remedy or Prevention. *The Theoriſt always ſuppoſes a Divine Providence to ſuperintend, proportion and determine, both the number and food of Animals upon the Earth: ſuitably to the conſtitution and circumſtances of every World.* That is, when *ordinary* Providence had put Nature into ſuch a condition, as to bring forth the aforeſaid animals, and many other, out of the Earth; *Extraordinary* Providence was to ſtand by, and either hinder them from riſing into animation; or elſe knock them on

on the head as fast as they quickned, and send them packing out of life again. As if divine Providence imitated *Penelope*; unravelling by night, what it weav'd by day. Thus he pulls down his own Censure upon himself: *Methinks they make very bold with the Deity, when they make Him do and undo, go forward and backwards by such countermarches and retractions, as we do not willingly impute to the Wisdom of GOD ALMIGHTY.* Eng. The. p. 20.

CHAP. XIV.

HEre another *Vital Assertion* of the Theory's is excepted against; and Reasons are given why the Deluge cannot be rightly explicated by the *Dissolution of the Earth*, or its *Disruption and fall into the Abyss.* The first is, because *it would be inconsistent with* Moses's *Description of Paradise*; which he has made according to proper Rules of Topography. But, says the Answerer, *this Objection, I'm afraid, will fall heavier upon* Moses, *or upon the Excepter himself, than upon the Theorist.* And why so? Why, because that place of Paradise *cannot be understood or determin'd by the Mosaical Topography, one of these two things must be allowed*; *either that the description was insufficient and ineffectual*: *or that there has been some great change in the Earth, whereby the Marks of it are destroy'd.—If he take the second of these Answers, he joins with the Theorist. If the first, he reflects upon the honour of* Moses, *or confutes himself.* *Moses*'s Topography of Paradise, as it was done by proper Rules, so it was sufficient and effectual enough for marking it out, as it *once* stood. And that it is not so *now*, is because (as the second Answer intimates) there has been a *great change* in the Earth, in that part of the Earth where the Paradisiacal Region was. And such a change may be allowed without *joining* with the Theorist, Disc. p. 285. Answ. p. 60. Ib.

riſt, as he Himſelf aſſures us. For he tells us in the ſame page, that good interpreters ſuppoſe, that the Chanels of Rivers were *very much changed* by the Flood. And a great change in the Chanels of Rivers, muſt make a great change in a Country: Eſpecially where that Country is deſcrib'd by thoſe Rivers; which is the caſe of Paradiſe. And this change is the very thing which makes the place of Paradiſe ſo hard to be found. Yet this, I ſay, is very far from *joining* with the Theoriſt. For according to him, the Chanels of Rivers were not only *changed*, but *all broke up*, and ſo quite put by, by that Fraction of the Earth which made the Flood. And not only the *Chanels* of Rivers were deſtroyed, but even the *Sources* of them too, by his Hypotheſis. For whereas the general Sources of all Rivers in the primitive World, were the Rainy Regions about the Poles; Thoſe Polar Regions fell in together with the reſt, and ſo Rivers which were before, could not afterward continue. Let him pleaſe to ſay therefore whether *Tygris* and *Euphrates* were before the Flood or not. If they were not, how could *Moſes* deſcribe Paradiſe by them? If they were, had the Flood come in by the Earth's Diſſolution, they muſt inevitably have been deſtroyed. But inſtead of that, they are ſtill in being; and this is an evidence that the Earth was not delug'd, by being diſſolv'd. Nor is this the only difficulty upon the Theoriſt here. For as to the place of Paradiſe, he refers himſelf wholly (as we have heard) to the Ancients; and they incline to ſeat it in the South, or South-Eaſt Land, in the other World. And can it enter into the mind of man to think, that *Havilah*, and *Æthiopia*, and *Aſſyria*, and *Hiddekel*, and *Euphrates*, which *Moſes* takes into the deſcription of Paradiſe; could ever be ſituate in the *other* Hemiſphere, when they are now found in *this*? If the Earth fell in, without queſtion it gave a deadly jounce.

Eng. Theor. p. 252.

But

But could it make these Countries and Rivers rebound with such force, as to leap quite beyond the torrid Zone, and settle some degrees on this side of our Tropic? There are a sort of Divinity Theorists,* who would fain perswade us, that the Lady of *Loretto's* Chamber went thither a Pilgrimage out of *Nazareth*. This is strangely marvellous: but the wonder of it will be much abated, if we can find the Regions and Rivers we speak of, going on procession out of the South-East Land, into this Northern Continent. I confess we are taught strange things of Paradise; but this its translation would surpass all. And how good soever its Soil was at first, certainly it grew very light at last, to hop thus far. Were this an effect of the Earth's fall, believe it, here is either a very fair tumbling Cast; or else our Author is in a foul mistake. And so indeed he must be; and the Objection which he was afraid would fall on *Moses*, or the Excepter; lights heavy on the Theorist.

* *Annus ipse nonagesimus primus ejus seculi erat, quod eodem anno, ac pene mense, natalis Deiparæ Virginis domus, deficiente cultu, ex Asia in* Europam, *cœlestium ministerio transit. Quæ primo in* Dalmatia, *inde quadriennio post in* Piceno *consedit.* Hor. Turiel. Epit. Hist. lib. 9. pag. *(mihi)* 302.

But out of this fear, he quickly rises into another Passion, if we may guess by his expressions in the next Paragraph. Tho I cannot but say, his Passion is as causeless, as his fear was groundless. For, speaking truth in a controversy, should never move choler. And did the Excepter do more than so, when he said, that *to affirm Moses's Description of Paradise to be false, must be horrid Blasphemy, it being Dictated by the H. GHOST*? Yet this is the word which he takes so ill. And truly so far as he has said any thing, that implies *Mose's* Topography of Paradise to be false; So far he ought to resent what was spoken; tho not with anger. And, pray, how can he (allowing own Hypothesis to be

Disc. p. 286.

true) defend *Moſes*'s deſcription of Paradiſe from being falſe; ſeeing he deſcribes it by Rivers, and thoſe Rivers, according to the Theory, could not be before the Flood? He attempts the Defence thus. *The Theoriſt ſuppoſes Rivers before the Flood, in great plenty, and why not like to theſe?* He himſelf has given Reaſons why they could not be *like* them. *'Tis true, if you admit our* Hypotheſis, *concerning the fraction and diſruption of the Earth at the Deluge, then we cannot expect to find rivers,* **as they were before,** *their general ſource is changed, and their Chanels are all broke up.* And if Rivers after the Flood, are not *as they were before* it; how can they be *alike*? And when their ſource was changed at the Deluge, and their Chanels all broke up; how is it poſſible but that they muſt differ *greatly* from what they were, in their ſituations, Courſes, *&c*? Which muſt utterly ſpoil them for being topographical marks; I mean the ſame true topographical marks to any Country, to which they formerly were ſo: And can they then be alike? That Perſon who can think that the Earth was diſſolved, and by that diſſolution fell a Mile or two downward, and by that fall was broken to pieces, and by that fraction was thrown into wildeſt diſorders; ſo that whereas before it had one entire, ſmooth, level, uniform Surface; it was thus made into Mountains, Hills, Valleys, Iſlands, Rocks, Seas, Gulphs, Lakes, *&c*. And yet can think again, that thoſe Rivers which were before this happened, ſhould in their ſituations and chanels (the principal circumſtances we are now concern'd in) be juſt *like* theſe after it; he muſt be one of a very ſtrong Phantſy, but withal of as weak a Judgment. And farther, *Moſes* does not deſcribe Paradiſe by Rivers *like* to *Tygris*, and *Euphrates*, and *Piſon*, and *Gihon*; but by thoſe *very ſame* Rivers as originally flowing there. And every *like*, we know, is far from being

Anſwer. p. 60.

Eng. The. p. 252.

being the *very ſame*. Men and Animals now upon Earth, are *like* to them before the Deluge: yet I hope they are not the *ſame* revived.

And then laſtly, the Theoriſt yields Paradiſe was in the *Southern* Hemiſphere, and ſo the Rivers of it before the Flood muſt be there too, and ſo they muſt riſe from the rainy Region at the *Antarctic* Pole, and ſo they muſt be very remote from the Land of *Havilah* and *Aſſyria*. Whereas ſince the Flood, *Moſes* deſcribes Paradiſe by *Tygris* and *Euphrates*, and theſe are Rivers in this *Northern* Hemiſphere, and they ſpring up from the Mountains of *Armenia*, and they run by or through the aforeſaid Countries. And is it to be thought then that thoſe Rivers before the Flood, and theſe Rivers ſince the Flood, could be *alike*? Eſpecially alike in ſhowing the Situation and the bounds of Paradiſe? from *Moſes*'s Deſcription or Topography of which, was the firſt Reaſon borrow'd againſt the Earth's Diſſolution. Concerning which he expoſtulates; *Is it not a ſtrange thing that the Diſſolution of the Earth ſhould be made Blaſphemy?* Yes, very ſtrange, and let them that make it ſo, be blamed for it. But ſtill to affirm that *Moſes*'s Deſcription of Paradiſe is *falſe*, would be *horrid* Blaſphemy, it being dictated by the H. GHOST. And *this* was the thing which the Excepter made Blaſphemy, (which the Anſwerer, if he thinks fit, may contradict.) And now the Replicant ſays farther, that to aſſert ſuch a Diſſolution of the Earth, as deſtroys *Moſes*'s Deſcription of Paradiſe, or implies it to be falſe; will indirectly, conſequentially, and reductively at leaſt, be of Blaſphemous importance. But the Anſwerer alledges; *that very Expreſſion*, **the Earth is diſſolved**, *is a Scripture Expreſſion* (*Pſalm.* 75. 3. *Iſai.* 24. 19. *Amos* 9. 5.) *which, methinks, might have been enough to have protected it from the imputation of Blaſphemy.*

Anſw. p. 61.

Ibid.

my. How well this Allegation will protect *him or what* he has ſaid, in any capacity or reſpect; I know not. I only ask, what diſſolution of the Earth, do the Pſalmiſt and Prophets mean, in the Places cited? Do they mean a *figurative, tropological* Diſſolution; or a *literal*, and ſuch a *real* one as the Theoriſt has invented, and which, according to him, did drown the World? If the *firſt*, their notion is nothing to the Anſwerer's purpoſe: if the *Second*, the Earth muſt have been delug'd, as *often* as they ſay it has been diſſolv'd. I cannot think, that our Anſwerer believes, that *Paleſtine* was literally or really diſſolv'd, in the prophet *Eſay's* time. Yet 'tis plain it was ſo, according to Scripture-expreſſion. *Thou* **whole** Paleſtina *are diſſolved, Iſai.* 14. 31. Which ſhows him clearly what Diſſolution of the Earth, Scripture means in the places cited; and what kind of protection that Scripture expreſſion will afford him: and conſequently how weak the Sanctuary is that he here flies to. In this Paragraph he inſinuates odious things of the Excepter. As if he were guilty of *a rude and injudicious defending of Scripture, by railing and ill language*, ſuch as tends to *the diminution* and *diſparagement of it.* As if he *made his own Conſequences to be of the ſame authority with the word of GOD*; and ſo *whatſoever is againſt them, muſt be charg'd with Blaſphemy againſt the H. GHOST.* And as if there were *nothing ſafe againſt* his *blind zeal and opinionative ignorance.* How eaſy were it here to retort and retaliate? But we muſt not render λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας Yet *he* having obſerved, that *weak reaſons commonly produce ſtrong paſſions*; we may without offence, meaſure his Arguments by his own Rule, and judge of their weakneſs by the ſentence proceeding out of his own mouth; and conclude that his Reaſons are like to be invalid, becauſe his Paſſions are ſo violent. By them, one would think he had taken

Anſw. p. 11.

a

a turn in his Torrid Zone, and was juſt now come piping hot out of it.

Secondly, the Diſſolution of the Earth could not be the cauſe of the general flood; becauſe *it would have utterly deſtroyed* Noah's *Ark and all that was in it*: ſaid the Excepter. But this was prevented *by the Theoriſt's putting the Ark under the Conduct of its Guardian Angels, and a miraculous Providence*, ſays the Anſwerer. And in proof that he did thus put the Ark under the Conduct of Angels; he cites theſe words out of the *Engliſh* Theory. *I think it had been impoſſible for the Ark to have liv'd upon the raging Abyſs; or for* Noah *and his Family to have been preſerved, if there had not been a miraculous hand of Providence to take care of them.* And then again he muſt needs fall pell-mell on the Excepter, tho he comes off as he uſes to do. *Now either the Excepter did not take notice of this paſſage in the Theory, or he does not allow that a miraculous hand was ſufficient to preſerve the Ark: or thirdly, that he made an objection, which he knew himſelf to be impertinent. And I confeſs, I am inclinable to think the laſt is true.* But by his leave, none of theſe three things are true, and the *real* truth is this. Tho he put the Ark under the conduct of Angels in the *extremity of the Flood*, and when it was *upon the raging Abyſs*; yet he left it *without* a miraculous hand to take care of it, *in its fall.* Yea, inſtead of that, it is evident, that he only put it into a *River*, or *Dock*, or *Ciſtern*, that *it might be afloat* there *before the Abyſs was broken open*; as if *that* could have ſav'd it from being daſht to pieces. And becauſe the Excepter did *not take notice* of this Contrivance, of this *River*, or *Dock*: he tells him of it in both ears: In the eighth Chapter of his Anſwer, and here in the fourteenth. But was there ſo great an injury done him, and had he ſuch mighty cauſe to complain, that that Thing

Diſc. p. 188.

p. 61.

Ib.

Ib. p. 62.

Ib.

p. 31.

p. 621.

was

was omitted, which himſelf *now* looks upon as *unneceſſary*? For he ſays, *after all, there is* **no neceſſity**
Ib. *that the Ark ſhould be afloat, before the Earth broke.* And for what reaſon? Why, *ordinary* providence being thus laid aſide, what can be expected but *Extraordinary providence* ſhould be brought in next? And ſo
Ib. it is with a witneſs, in theſe words. *The Angels, (whoſe miniſtery we own openly upon theſe grand occaſions) could as eaſily have held the Ark afloat, in the Air, as on the Water.* But becauſe Angels *could* do this, may we argue from thence with good conſequence that they *did* do it? and from their power to act it, conclude they effected it? Without queſtion they could have kept *Judea* dry, when all the reſt of the World was drown'd; yet, we know, this was not done. But the Ark however was *held afloat in the Air*, by them. For it follows, *the Ark, being an Emblem of the Church, GOD certainly did give his Angels charge over it; that they ſhould bear it up in their hands, that it might not be daſh'd againſt a ſtone.* Surely this Hypotheſis muſt needs be very ſtrong and laſting, that has ſo much miracle, and miniſtery of Angels to ſupport it. And then what matter for Philoſophy (tho *the Theory* is to *be chiefly Philoſophical, Eng. Th. p. 6.*) when it may ſtand much better without it? But the ſame pen writes
Eng. Tho. p. 98. thus in another place. Noah *and his Family* were ſav'd by water; *ſo as the water which deſtroy'd the reſt of the World, was an inſtrument of their Conſervation, inaſmuch as it bore up the Ark, and kept it from that impetuous ſhock, which it would have had, if it had either ſtood upon dry land when the Earth fell, or if the Earth had been diſſolv'd without any water on it or under it.* Now if *Noah* and his Family were ſaved by *water*; if the water which deſtroy'd the reſt of the world, was an *inſtrument* of their *Conſervation*; if it conſerv'd them as

it

it *bore up* the Ark; and if it ſo bore it up, as that it kept it from an *impetuous ſhock*, which otherwiſe it would have had when the Earth fell: how could the Anſwerer ſay, there was *no* neceſſity *that the Ark ſhould be afloat before the Earth broke*; and now make the conſervation of *Noah* and his Ark, at the fall of the Earth, to be wholly *Angelical*? In ſhort; the *Theoriſt* affirms, that mankind was ſaved by water that bore up the Ark, and kept it from an impetuous ſhock when the Earth fell; it having the Advantage of a River, or of a Dock, or Ciſtern, wherein to float. The *Anſwerer*, that there was no neceſſity that the Ark ſhould be afloat before the Earth broke, becauſe the Angels could hold it in the Air; and they having charge over it, *did* bear it up in their hands. The Queſtion therefore might be put, which of the two ſpeaks trueſt. But e'en let them agree the difference as they pleaſe, and reconcile the plain Contradiction between them. But for the Ark's being afloat in a River, or Dock, or Ciſtern, before the Earth fell; he has this pretence. *Thoſe things were premis'd in the Theory, only to ſoften the way to men that are hard of belief in ſuch extraordinary matters.* Truly theſe matters are very Extraordinary; and the way to believing them had need be well ſoftned. But when *that* is ſoftned, if ſo be *men* are not ſoftned withal, and made extraordinarily ſoft too; they will hardly ever believe them at laſt. And pray, what are the *Extraordinary matters*, to the belief of which, the Arks being afloat in a River, or Dock, or Ciſtern; was to ſoften the way? They ſeem to be the ſaving of *Noah*, and the ſaving of his *Family*, and the ſaving of the *Ark*, when the Earth fell. But then in truth theſe things could not be thoſe matters. For we are here told (at the ſame time) that there was *no neceſſity* of the Arks being afloat

Another Contradiction.

Anſw. p. 62.

afloat in water, in order to theſe things: and that *Noah*, and his Family, and the Ark, were ſaved by the *Miniſtery of Angels*. And to the belief of the *Angels ſaving* them, ſuch a mollification would be vain and needleſs; inaſmuch as every one who believes their Exiſtence, believes alſo what the Anſwerer ſays of them; that they could as *eaſily* have held the Ark *afloat in the Air*, as in the Water. And ſo what was premiſed in the Theory, of this *ſoftning* Nature; and what the Excepter is blamed for *not noting*, was of as little uſe, as it is of truth. And to ſhut up this particular; by calling in this extraordinary help of the Angels, he renders the Rains at the Deluge (the principal Cauſe of it, *Gen.* 7. 4.) wholly *unneceſſary*. For tho at *firſt* he would have them to ſave the Ark by ſetting it afloat; yet *now* we ſee there was *no neceſſity* of that. And then if the Earth fell into the Abyſs, and by its fall made the waters of it ſo *raging* and *deſtructive* to all things, as he repreſents them; there could be no more need of forty days rain in order to the Flood; than of forty Candles to give light to the Sun. And ſo GOD did a great work to no end or purpoſe. Eſpecially this 40 days rain following the Diſruption; Which happened the very firſt day that *Noah* entred the Ark.

A Third Reaſon againſt the Floods coming in by the Diſſolution of the Earth, was this. *The Earth (or dry Land of this Terraqueous Globe) would in likelihood have been of another Figure than what it now bears.* But inſtead of anſwering it, he ſpeaks againſt a *change* in the *Poles* and *Circles* of the Earth; a needleſs trouble, and occaſion'd by his own overſight. For had he but lookt into the *Errata's*, he might have ſeen there, that thoſe Parentheſes, upon which he grounded what he ſays, ſhould have been left out. And in caſe he *did* peruſe the Errata's, and obſerve that theſe Parentheſes were marked for

Diſc. p. 289.

Anſw. p. 63.

for *ſuch*; I may ſay of him, as he ſaid of the Excepter, *it muſt be a wilful diſſimulation not to take notice of them.* *Ib. p. 62.* And if he had taken notice of them as Errata's, he need not have troubled himſelf farther about them. And ſo we paſs to

The Fourth Reaſon. *Had the Earth been diſſolved to make the Flood; its Diſſolution would have brought it into lamentable barrenneſs.* For the dry and dead Soil would have been turned up by whole Countries at once: and where the outward part of the Earth continu'd outward ſtill; the top of the Ground would have been rinſed off, by the vehement workings and inceſſant beatings of the Flood upon it. And then the furious commotions and æſtuations of the Waters, waſhing off an abundance of Earth, from the innumerable Fragments which fell into the Abyſs; and this Earthy ſtuff being carried into all places, and ſpread thick upon the Ground, and mix'd and incorporated with much other Filth; it would have hardned (upon the going off of the Flood) into a Cruſt or Cap on the ſurface of the Earth, and ſo have been very deſtructive to its Fruitfulneſs. Read *Diſc. p.* 290, 291, 292.

It is anſwered firſt, *I willingly allow, that ſome of the interiour and barren parts of the Earth might be turn'd up; as we now ſee in mountainous and wild Countries: but this rather confirms the Theory, than weakens it.* He muſt allow (according to the tenour of his Hypotheſis) not only that *ſome*, but that *many* of the interiour barren parts of the Earth were turned up every where. And then the Waters being ſo ſtrangely tumultuous, and the fluctuations of them ſo extremely boiſterous, and their mighty rage of ſo long continuance; While they were *carried up to a great height in the Air*, and fell down again with prodigious weight and force; they could not but harraſs the Ground at ſuch a rate, as to wear away the upper part of it, and make the top of the *Anſw. p. 64.* The Tumult of the Waters, and the extremity of the Deluge laſted for ſome Months. *Eng. Theor. p. 76.* *Ib. p. 75.*

the Earth as bare and barren as the bottom of a river, by their monſtrous and unſpeakable Surgings. Secondly, he anſwers, *that the filth and ſoil would have made*
p. 64. *the Earth more barren, I cannot allow. For good husbandmen overflow their grounds, to make their Crops more Rich. And 'tis generally ſuppoſed that the inundation of the* Nile, *and the mud it leaves behind it, makes* Egypt *more fruitful. Beſides, this part of the objection lies againſt the common Explication of the Deluge, as well as againſt that which is given by the Theory.* But when good Husbandmen overflow their grounds to improve their Crops; they do it *ſeaſonably*, and they do it *moderately*, and to be ſure they do not at the ſame time turn them up for *half a mile* or *a mile* deep. And tho ſeveral Rivers do inrich grounds by their Inundations, by vertue of a great plenty of unctuous mud which they bring upon them, that makes the Soil new as it were; (ſo *Hermus* does, and alſo *Cayſter*, *Menander*, and *Caicus*, as *Strabo* informs us from *Nearchus*) yet that mud which the Deluge would have left, would have been of a ſilty and ſandy nature, and ſo of a lean, and hungry, and ſtarven quality, as being moſtly waſht off from the Edges of thoſe pieces into which the diſſolved Earth was ſhattered: and conſequently would rather have prevented and hindred, than helped or promoted the Earth's fruitfulneſs. And therefore the Geographer notes, that the mud of the aforeſaid Rivers, which *makes* the fields over which they flow; is not coarſe and dry (like that which would have been eaten off of the verges of the terreſtrial Fragments) but of a *ſofter* and *fatter* ſort. And then as to the *Nile*, that the Mud it brings down upon the Land of *Egypt*, is light and ſoft, and fat; and ſo fit to impregnate it with a ſtrong Fertility: we may properly

Nearchus *de fluviorum effuſione hæc affert exempla, quod dictum eſt,* Hermi, *&* Cayſtri, *&* Mæandri, *&* Caici, *campos ſimiles eſſe, propter limum qui e montibus delatus campos auget, imo facit.* Strabo *Geogr. li.* 15.

Deferre autem flumina eum qui mollior ſit, & pinguior ex quo campi fiunt. Id. Ib.

properly infer from the ſweetneſs of its Waters. For as *Diodorus* reports, they are the ſweeteſt of all that are in the whole Earth. Which made that famous General, *Piſcenius Niger*, (who contended with *Septimus Severus* for the Empire) reprimand his Souldiers for hankering after wine, and for muttering for the want of it; when they might drink their fill of this pleaſant Stream. Tho it is well known, that an ingenious *French* Writer, I mean *Duval* (in his *Geogr. Univerſ.*) aſcribes both the *Muddineſs*, *Fruitfulneſs*, and *Overflow* of it; to its *Nitrous* Quality. His words are to this purpoſe. *It has lately been found out, that the* Nitre *wherewith the* Nile *abounds ſo much, is the cauſe of all thoſe wonderful Effects; and that being heated by the ſun, it mingles it ſelf with the water, renders it troubled, ſwells it, and makes it paſs over its Banks.* But yet concerning this noble River it is as well known; that as ſometimes it has not increaſed at all, (as in the tenth and eleventh year of *Cleopatra*, againſt the downfal and the death of that Princeſs, and her admired *Anthony*:) and as ſometimes it is defective in its increaſe, to lamentable failures in the uſual Products of that plentiful Country: So if at any time it happens to exceed in its increment, but two or three Cubits; that exceſs is at once both a clear Prognoſtic, and a certain Cauſe, of a dearth or ſcarcity in the enſuing year. But then that ſuch a Deluge as the Theory ſuppoſes, (it being Univerſal, and of long continuance, and made of lean ſubterraneous water, and full of dead, and harſh, and heavy ſoil, fetcht off from numberleſs pieces of the broken Earth) ſhould occaſion barrenneſs, for a conſiderable time, in the poſt-diluvian World; is but reaſonable to conclude. Nor laſtly does this part of the Objection lie againſt the common Explication of the Deluge, with ſuch force as it does againſt the Theory's Explication of it. For

tho a General Flood overtopping the Mountains, muſt have left mud, and ſlime, and filth behind it; yet where the water riſe upon an Earth that remained unbroken, they could be nothing in *quantity*, to what they muſt have been where the Earth was diſſolv'd and fell all to pieces; and where the water boiling up from under theſe Fragments, and then falling down again violently upon them, raged amongſt them with laſting, inceſſant, and unimaginable turbulence.

Diſc. p. 292. As a Fifth Reaſon againſt the Earth's being drowned, by its being diſſolved, the Excepter added this. *All the Buildings erected before the Flood, would have been ſhaken down, or elſe overwhelmed.* Here, as to the City *Joppa* (which is the main hinge upon which the Objection turns) he Anſwers: it is *incertain* whether it *p.* 64. was built before the Flood. But beſides the authorities of *Mela* and *Solinus* cited for it, it is generally granted to be ſo ancient; and none that ſpeak of its Antiquity, take upon them to deny it. Nor will the Fiction concerning *Perſeus* and *Andromeda*, ſubvert the receiv'd opinion in this matter. For as many Fables are made out of true ſtories, ſo many again are tacked *p.* 64, 65. to them. He goes on; *However ſuppoſe the ruines of one Town remain'd after the Flood; does this prove that the Earth was not diſſolv'd? I do not doubt, but there were ſeveral tracts of the Earth, much greater than that Town, that were not broken all to pieces by their fall.* Had that tract, whereon *Joppa* ſtood, continued whole; yet falling down ſo very low (a mile at leaſt;) by the force of its weight it would have ſuffer'd ſuch a ſhock, as could not but have levell'd its Buildings with the ground. Thus very good houſes are oftentimes ſhatter'd down in Earthquakes, meerly by the concuſſion or ſhaking of the Ground, tho it never breaks. And truly if only the bare *ruines* of it had remained (which we do not,

nor

nor need not grant) yet theſe muſt have given as fatal a blow to the Theory, as the fall of the Earth would have done to this City. For *their* very *out-laſting* the fury of the Deluge, would prove that *Joppa* conſiſted, not *of a Number of Cottages, made of branches of trees,* *of Oſiers, and Bull-ruſhes; or of Mud-Walls and Straw Roofs* (which then muſt all have been quite waſht away:) but of Edifices made of *ſuch Materials*, as could never be prepared, formed, and ſet up, without *Iron tools*. And ſo we come to *Anſw. p. 50.*

The Laſt Reaſon againſt the ſuppoſed diſſolution of the Earth. *It would have made GOD's Covenant with* Noah, *a very vain and trifling thing.* Becauſe then the Earth was not capable *of*, or liable *to* **ſuch another Deluge.** It is here anſwered: *So much is true, that the Deluge in the courſe of Nature, will not return again in the ſame way.* If it returns not in the ſame way, that is, in the courſe of nature; it cannot be *ſuch another Deluge* as *Noah's* was: for that came in by the Courſe of Nature. He proceeds; *But unleſs GOD prevents it, it both may and will return in another way. That is, if the World continues long enough, the Mountains will wear and ſink and the Waters, in proportion, riſe; and overflow the whole Earth.* How poſſible ſoever ſuch a Deluge may be in long proceſs of time; yet Chriſtians, who believe the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and that principal Article of it, the World's Conflagration; can never think that it ſhall come to paſs. For if the World in the end, were to be overflow'd with Water; how could it, according to St. *Peter*, be *reſerved unto fire*? And GOD having thus declar'd that he will prevent it, His Covenant with *Noah* could have no relation to ſuch a natural Overflow. This piece of anſwer therefore is ſo very thin, that a weak eye may eaſily ſee through it, and diſcern that there is ſhifting at the bottom of it. *See Diſc. p. 296, 297, 298.* *p. 65.* Read the beginning of the 6th. Chapter of this *Reply.* *Anſw. p. 65.* *2 Pet. 3. 7.*

He

Anſw. p. 65. He adds therefore; *GOD might, when He pleaſed, by an extraordinary power, and for the ſins of men, bring another Deluge upon the World. And that is the thing which* Noah *ſeems to have feared, and which GOD, by his Covenant, ſecur'd him againſt.* *Noah's* Flood was brought upon the World for the *ſins of men*; And if *another* Flood may be brought in, upon that account, by GOD's *extraordinary power*; then *Noah's* Flood might come in by that power too, even by its *creating* waters to make it. Which in caſe it had been but yielded at firſt, it might have ſav'd the pains, of ſetting up this Hypotheſis. And not only ſo, but likewiſe have ſuperſeded the collateral trouble, of too weak and ineffectual endeavours to ſupport it. And when all is ſaid, the *ſole* reaſon why ſuch another flood as *Noah's* was, ſhall never come in again; is not any change in Nature, rendring the thing difficult or impoſſible; but the unchangeable *covenant* of GOD, as appears, *Iſai.* 54. 9. Where GOD, to illuſtrate the ſtability of his kindneſs to the *Jewiſh* Church, and to ſhow that its calamity ſhall never be reiterated; compares it to the ſure and perpetual excluſion of the waters of *Noah*, to the return of which, his immutable *Oath* is the eternal bar. *For this is as the waters of* Noah *unto me: for as I have ſworn that the waters of* Noah *ſhould* no more *go over the Earth; ſo have I ſworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee.*

Thus we have done with the Anſwer to our Exceptions. In which I am not conſcious to my ſelf, that I have omitted any *one thing*, which deſerves notice and a Reply. And here I might *ſpeak freely* of this Anſwer. But becauſe its defects are plain and obvious enough to the intelligent; I only ſay this much. That I expected a better from the Author of the Theory, or none at all.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

HEre the Scæne changes; and our Anſwerer now becomes an Objector; and manages this part, as he did the other. And as an inſtance of as much, he trips in the firſt ſtep that he makes, and ſtumbles into a Miſtake. For he affirms, that *the firſt Propoſition laid down for the eſtabliſhing of* our Hypotheſis, *is this.* **That the Flood was but fifteen Cubits high, above the ordinary level of the Earth.** But as any one, that pleaſes, may ſee, the Propoſition laid down as the foundation of our Hypotheſis, is *verbatim* this. *That the* **higheſt parts** *of the Earth, that is, of the common ſurface of it, were under Water but* **fifteen Cubits** *in depth.* And between the *common ſurface* (or *ordinary level*) of the Earth; and the *higheſt parts* of that ſurface, or level; there is great difference. For according to the firſt, the Waters *were not* 30 *foot high*, as he noted: but according to the latter, *they might, in moſt places, be thirty, forty, or fifty Cubits high, or higher*, as we obſerved. And whereas it is ſaid of the Waters of the Flood, *that they were but* **fifteen Cubits high** *in all, above the ſurface of the Earth*; it is manifeſt that the *higheſt parts* of its ſurface were there intended, by what follows, in explanation of that Clauſe, even to the end of the Paragraph. Touching the Propoſition he cries out, *This is an unmerciful Paradox.* But who could have lookt for ſuch an Exclamation, from *him* whoſe own Paradoxes are ſo many and *unmerciful*! Here therefore περιτρεπεται ὁ λόγος. His Cenſure returns double upon himſelf. And while he finds fault with the *ſliver in my Teeth*; I may juſtly give him the *Talmudic* anſwer, uſually directed to the more guilty Reprehender, טול קורהמביון ענך *take the Beam out of thine eyes.*

Anſw. p. 66.

Diſc. p. 301.

Ib. l. 12.

Diſc. p. 300. l. 31.

Ib. l. 27.

Anſw. p. 66.

Then

Ib. p. 66, 67. Then he enquires, *under what notion muſt this Propoſition be receiv'd? as a* Poſtulatum, *or as a* Concluſion? *If it be a* Poſtulatum, *it muſt be clear from its own light, or acknowledg'd by general conſent. It cannot pretend to be clear from its own light, becauſe it is matter of fact, which is not known, but by Teſtimony. Neither is it generally acknowledg'd: for the general opinion is, that the Waters covered the tops of the Mountains, and were fifteen Cubits higher.* We might bring this home to the *vital Aſſertions* of the Theory; but let us try but one of them. Namely, that the *Primitive Earth was* **without a Sea.** Under what notion muſt this Propoſition be receiv'd? As a *Poſtulatum*, or as a *Concluſion*? If it be a *Poſtulatum*, it muſt be clear from its own light, or acknowledg'd by general conſent. It cannot pretend to be clear from its own light, becauſe it is matter of fact, which is not known but by teſtimony. Neither is it generally acknowledg'd; For the general opinion is, that the Firſt Earth had an Open Sea. Wherefore we may well go on (with a little variation) againſt the Anſwerer, as he does againſt the Excepter. *It muſt not therefore be made a* Poſtulatum, *that ſuch an Aſſertion is*

Ib. p. 67. *true, but the truth of it muſt be demonſtrated by good proofs.* But the *good* and *demonſtrating* proofs of this, are ſtill wanting. And ſo that blame which he would fling upon the Excepter, falls upon himſelf; recoiling back by juſt recrimination.

Next he is for noting *one or two things, wherein* the Excepter *ſeems to be inconſiſtent with himſelf, or with good*

Ib. *ſenſe.* An high Charge, and ſuch as inevitably draws ſhame after it, either upon him againſt whom it is made, or elſe upon the Maker of it. And where will he find this inconſiſtency to clear himſelf? He looks for it firſt in theſe words of the Excepter. *Not that I will be bound to defend what I ſay, as true and real.* Now where's the

the *inconſiſtency* of theſe words, either with *him* that ſpake them, or with *good ſenſe*? Rather how *conſiſtent* is it with a mans ſelf, and with good ſenſe; *not* to be bound to defend, what he thinks *may not* be true and real? Yet as if he would make good his charge out of theſe very words; he Querys immediately, *But why does he then trouble himſelf, or the World, with an Hypotheſis, which he does not believe to be true and real?* Many have written ingenious and uſeful things, which they never believed to be *true* and *real*: but were they for this *troublers* of the World, and *inconſiſtent with themſelves*, or *with good ſenſe?* And why then ſhould the Excepter's Hypotheſis be ſo, for his not believing it to be true and real? Eſpecially when he ſo far *inſinuates* his miſtruſt or doubt of it, as to declare he would not defend it as *true* and *real.* Beſides, an *Hypotheſis*, in the very term of it, being but a *Suppoſition*; it would have been more like inconſiſtency with himſelf, or with good ſenſe; if he *had* believed it to be *true* and *real.* For in caſe it be a *true* and *real* thing, why ſhould it any longer be an *hypotheſis*? And therefore he who fancies the Theory to be a *Reality*; affirms it to be *ſomething* more *than a* bare *Hypotheſis*: and will have it to riſe above *the character of a* bare *Hypotheſis*; and be a *true* piece of *natural hiſtory*, and the *greateſt* and moſt *remarkable that hath yet been ſince the beginning of the World.* The *Inconſiſtency* he talks of, is not to be found here; whither goes he to ſeek it next? Why, he has recourſe to this ſaying of the Excepter's. *Our Suppoſition ſtands ſupported by Divine authority: as being founded upon Scripture. Which tells us, as plainly as it can ſpeak, that the Waters prevailed but fifteen Cubits upon the Earth.* Now tho nothing of the ſuggeſted Inconſiſtency, appears here neither, *prima facie*, or at firſt glance; yet he labours to diſcover it by what fol-

Eng. Theo. p. 149.

Ib. p. 150.

Anſw. p. 67.

Ib. p. 67, 68. lows. *If his Hypotheſis be founded upon Scripture; and upon Scripture as plainly as it can ſpeak; why will not he defend it as true and real? For to be ſupported by Scripture, and plain Scripture, is as much as we can alledge for the Articles of our faith; which every one ſurely is bound to defend.* In our entrance on this new Hypotheſis, we deſired allowance to *make bold with Scripture a* little, *Diſc. p. 299.* *as the Theory had done* a great deal. And afterward we declared, that we had no reaſon to take our ſingularity *Ib. p. 325.* in expounding *a Text or two of Scripture*, as an Objection againſt us; if brought by the *Theoriſt*, or *them* that hold with him. For *that* indeed is but an imperfect Tranſcript of his own Copy, and a faint imitation of his extravagant Pattern; ſhowing him, as in a dark and ſhort reſemblance, a ſhadow of that large unuſual Liberty, which he aſſum'd to himſelf, not eaſy to be parallell'd. And therefore for him to lay hold of our ſupporting our Hypotheſis by plain Scripture (as if we forc'd or wreſted, miſinterpreted or miſapply'd it in ſo doing, when at the ſame time we openly profeſs, that we make *bold* with it;) is no better than a foreſtalled Argument; otherwiſe a Cavil. And farther, (as the Anſwerer himſelf noted juſt now) we would not be *bound to defend what we ſay*, of the new Hypotheſis, *as true and real.* And therefore the founding it upon Scripture, and making that to ſupport it plainly; cannot poſſibly be underſtood, by men of ſenſe, to be done otherwiſe than in an *hypothetic* or *ſuppoſitious* way. And thus the Excepter is ſo far from proving *inconſiſtent* with himſelf or good ſenſe; that how could he be more *conſiſtent* with both, than in refuſing to defend, as true and real, what he only *ſuppoſed* to be thus *founded* upon Scripture and *ſupported* by it. And whatever he ſaid of that nature, was ſpoken only in way of ſuppoſition conjectural. Yea, tho it was ſpoken never ſo

poſitively,

positively, it was but to set forth, *rei personam*; to make the more full and lively representation of the supposed thing. And therefore before he began his new Explication of the Flood, he premised this caution (*Disc. p.* 300.) *Where we speak* **never so positively**, *still what we deliver is to be lookt upon, not as an absolute, but as a comparative Hypothesis.* And so not as really founded upon Scripture, and supported by it; but as *supposed* to be so only. The Answerer therefore, in this business need not have brought in so over-strain'd a comparison, as *the Articles of our Faith.* Betwixt which and Hypotheses, there is greatest Difference; the one, being no less than truths of GOD; and the other, no more than Imaginations of men. And as they are very different *things*, so Scripture supports them very different *ways*. Articles of Faith it supports directly, and mainly, by Divine Revelation: Hypotheses, collaterally and presumptively, by humane fiction or imputation. And as Scripture supports them in a different manner; so we are bound to defend them in as different a measure. For Articles of Faith we are bound to defend to the very Death; but who are oblig'd to be Martyrs for Philosophy? Yea, some who build Hypotheses upon Scripture-Foundations; I believe will rather let them fall, and moreover help to pull them down; than stand a fiery Trial to uphold them. We are told, that S. *Peter convinces* us, that the Theorist's Description of the Antediluvian Earth, and of the Deluge; is a *reality*. And that other places of Scripture seem *manifestly* to describe the form of his Abyss with the Earth above it. And that Scripture it self doth *assure* us that the Earth rise at first out of his Chaos. Yet I am apt to think (and I hope without breaking the Law of Charity) That the Learned Author of these Notions, would hardly venture to defend them in

p. 68.

Eng. Theor. p. 85.

Ib. p. 86.

Ib. p. 150.

Smithfield; as glorious Witneſſes have done the Articles of our Faith.

The pretended *Inconſiſtency* is hitherto inviſible; and concerning it we may return, a *non eſt inventa*. On he goes therefore, as by a *melius Inquirendo*, and makes farther ſearch after it in the enſuing Paragraph. The ſtrength it has, lies much in the cloſe of it, and expreſ-

Anſw. p. 69. ſes it ſelf in this Argument. *The Church-way of explaining the Deluge, is either* rational, *or* irrational. *If he ſay it is* rational, *why does he deſert it, and invent a new one? And if he ſay it is* irrational, *then that dreadful thing, which,* **he cannot well endure to ſpeak, That the Church of GOD has ever gone on in an irrational way of explaining the Deluge,** *falls flat upon himſelf.* The laſt vital Aſſertion of the Theory, which the Excepter undertook in his Fifteenth Chapter, is this. *That neither* Noah's *Flood, nor the preſent form of the Earth, can be explained in any other method that is rational, nor by any other cauſes that are intelligible*, beſides thoſe which the Theory aſſigns. Whence follows (*what I cannot well endure to ſpeak*, ſaid the Excepter,) *that the Church of GOD has ever gone on in* **an irrational way** *of explaining the Deluge.* Now, ſays the Anſwerer, this charge *falls flat upon himſelf*: and he attempts to prove it, by the Argument produced. But we take it off with this direct and plain Reply.

Firſt, we ſay, that the Church-way of explaining the Deluge is very *rational*. For it implies no more than GOD's creating Waters ſufficient for it, and his annihilating them again: which is not in the leaſt inconſiſtent with reaſon or repugnant to it. Tho evident it is, that *his* vital Aſſertion, *expreſsly* condemns this way, in which GOD's Church has ever gone, as both *irrational* and *unintelligible* at once. Methinks an excuſe or defence of *this* ſhould have been more ſeaſonable, than what

what we here meet with. Unleſs he thinks that ſo black a blemiſh, can be faſtned on the wiſeſt and nobleſt Society in the whole World, without offence; or means that the Readers Judgment, for his unadviſed raſhneſs ſhould paſs upon him in courſe, by *nihil dicit.*

Secondly, we ſay, that we *do not deſert* or reject the Church-way of explaining the Deluge. We allow indeed, as he notes, That it may be *diſguſtful* to the beſt and ſoundeſt *Philoſophic* Judgments: and the reaſons are given, why. But then it is manifeſt, that we ſhut out *Philoſophy* from *ruling* in this Caſe, as being in a good degree *miraculous. The Flood was a* Miracle *in good meaſure. Or had ſo much miracle running through it, and interwoven with it; that all paſſages in it, are not to be accounted for by Reaſon and* Philoſophy. *And truly where* Nature *was over-rul'd by* Providence; *it is but fit that* Philoſophy *ſhould give place to* Omnipotence. And whereas he obſerves, that we ſay, that by our Hypotheſis, *we are excuſed from running to thoſe Cauſes or Methods, which ſeem unreaſonable to ſome, and unintelligible to others, and unſatisfactory to moſt*: This is no proof that the Excepter deſerts the *Churches* way of Explaining the Deluge. For however *ſome*, or *others*, may think it *unreaſonable*, and *unintelligible*, as the Theoriſt makes it: and how unſatisfactory ſoever *ſome* of the cauſes or methods alledg'd by the Excepter, may be to *moſt*: yet *the* Excepter is of the mind that the Churches method, is very rational, and eaſy to be underſtood. And tho he farther remarks, that the Excepter ſays, that the ordinary Suppoſition, that the Mountains were covered with water in the Deluge, *brings on a neceſſity of ſetting up a* **new Hypotheſis** *for explaining the Flood*: yet that neceſſary *new Hypotheſis*, which the Excepter means, will plainly ſhow, that he *juſtifies* and *defends* the Church-Hypotheſis; inſtead of *deſerting* it. For it is only this.

Diſc. p. 313.

Ib. p. 355.

Anſw. p. 68.

Ib.

We

We muſt ſuppoſe that the Mountains of *Ararat*, whereon the Ark reſted in the height of the Deluge, were *then* the higheſt Mountains in the World: but ſince that time they are either worn down, or ſunk and ſettled lower than ſome others. Admit but this; and then Scripture, Geography, and the Churches method of explaining the Flood, will all be reconcil'd: and the uſual Hypotheſis will ſtand clear of *material* Difficulties and Objections.

Thirdly, we ſay, that tho we *invented* a new Hypotheſis; it was not ſet up in *competition* with this of the *Church*, but in *compariſon* with that of the *Theory*, and in *Confutation* of its *laſt* vital Aſſertion. For it makes it evident, that there is *another* way of explaining *Noah*'s Flood, both *rational* in its *method*, and *intelligible* in its *cauſes*; at leaſt *as* rational and intelligible as *his*. And as ſuch a *Comparative* Hypotheſis (as we have made it) it may poſſibly ſtand almoſt as long as the Theoriſt's (which draws *more* and *greater* Abſurdities after it.) Eſpecially if it ſhould have but a *Second Edition* to ſupport it on the one ſide, and a *Review* to prop it up on the other, and have many things *left out* of it, and have one word in it *explain'd* by another, and have here and there a *Contradiction* allow'd it, *&c.* And thus the Excepter is freed from the objected inconſiſtency with himſelf and good ſenſe.

Diſc. p. 300. l. 18.

This ſame Reply will take off thoſe Objections alſo, which are brought on by the Anſwerer, at the bottom of his ſeventieth Page; as being of near affinity with what he laſt alledged.

Having thus made his general Obſervations, he comes now to Particulars. The firſt he pitches upon, is the *Height of the Deluge-waters*, which we ſet at *fifteen Cubits above the higheſt parts of the common Surface of the Earth*; making it the *Foundation* of our Hypotheſis,

theſis, and ſuppoſing it to *reſt* upon Scripture, and to be *ſupported* by that. *This* therefore, he ſays, *muſt needs raiſe our Curioſity, to ſee that place of Scripture, which has been overlookt by* all the Learned hitherto. But if learned mens *overlooking* this Text, as to the ſenſe that we apply it to, be a juſt Objection againſt our alledging it: how much more ſtrongly muſt the ſame Objection come againſt the Theoriſt, for alledging ſo many Texts as he does, in confirmation of ſuch new and ſtrange notions, as none of the learned could ever ſee contained in them, or confirmed by them; but always *overlookt* them as to ſuch meanings? Then he urges; Scripture *ſays plainly that the Mountains were covered with waters*; and *how could fifteen Cubits reach to the tops of the Mountains?* This Objection is fully anſwered in our Diſcourſe: only thus much may be here put in. As the high Mountains were covered with Waters, ſo the Camp of *Iſrael* was covered with Quails. Yet thoſe Quails which covered the Camp, were but *two Cubits* high upon the face of the Earth, *Numb.* 11. 31. Now if two Cubits of Quails could cover this Camp; then fifteen Cubits of Water might cover theſe Mountains. And as for the *Tops* of the Mountains, they are no where ſaid to be covered, any more than the *top* of the Camp was. But he ſays, *the Tops of the Mountains were diſcover'd, when the Waters began to decreaſe*, Gen. 8. 5. *Is not that a plain demonſtration that they were cover'd before, and cover'd with thoſe Waters?* To this Objection alſo an anſwer was given by the Excepter. However to make it more full, we are content to recite part of what was formerly ſaid, and to add ſomewhat new, as occaſion requires. We ſay therefore that the tops of the Mountains being diſcovered upon the decreaſe of the Waters, is *no demonſtration* that they were *covered* with them: for they might

Anſw. p. 69.

Anſw. p. 67.

Ib. p. 69.

Chap. 16. Parag. 3.

Gen. 7. 20.

Exod. 16. 13.

Anſw. p. 70.

Diſc. Ch. 16. §. 5.

might be diſcovered by their *Emergency out of darkneſs.*
Anſw. p. 73. Upon that Anſwer he brings this Quæry. *Where finds he this Account? 'tis neither in the Text nor in Reaſon.* It was fairly gathered out of *both*, as plainly appears in our Diſcourſe. The holy *Text* we went upon, was *Gen.* 8. *ult.* Where *day* being ſettled upon the recovering World: the very *ſettling* of it then, implies, that in time of the Flood, the Earth was ſtrangely *benighted.* And for a *Reaſon*, was ſuggeſted, the *Excluſion of Froſt.* Which, had not the Air been *very thick* (thick enough to hide the Tops of the Mountains from the Eyes of men) would have ſeiz'd the Waters with exceeding vehemence, and have thereby hindred the ſo *ſpeedy* drying of the Earth. But he goes on in his way of objecting: *If it was always ſo dark, and the Tops of the*
Ib. *Mountains and Rocks naked and prominent every where, how could the Ark avoid them in that darkneſs?* And could it, by an ordinary Providence, have avoided them in the *Light?* For tho the H. GHOST, in that Deſcription which he was pleas'd to give of the Ark, deſcends even to Particulars, and that to the very *Door*, and the *Window* of it; yet He hints not the leaſt concerning a *Rudder* belonging to it. And being deſtitute of that, there could be nothing whereby to turn or govern it; but at all times it muſt be left to drive right on, whatever Dangers (tho great and viſible) might come in its way. Or ſay it had an *Helm*; yet what Pilot, without inſpiration, could have ſteer'd its Courſe ſafely, in thoſe perilous, new-made Seas upon Earth? Where, as Rocks, and Banks, and Flats, and Sands, were thick ſet and innumerable; ſo there was not ſo much as one Buoy or Sea-mark, which, by ſhowing any of them, might help to ſhun them. And as theſe dangers, according to the *Common* Hypotheſis, would have been equal, when *firſt* this Veſſel was ſet afloat;

ſo

ſo according to the *Theory*, they would have been *much greater*. He continues to object. *I ſee no reaſon to imagine, that there would be darkneſs after the forty days rain.*——For *he* (the Excepter) *ſays, the Atmoſphære was never ſo exhauſted of Vapours, and never ſo thin; as when the waters were newly come down.* Tho the Atmoſphære was never ſo exhauſted of Vapours, and never ſo thin as at that time, in the vaſt Body, or general Comprehenſion of it *upwards*; yet here *below*, the Air might ſtill be foggy and thick. So we are often invelop'd with caliginous Miſts in this lower Region next the Earth; when let *them* but diſperſe and wear off, and the heaven above is moſt ſerene, and in the Skie there's nothing but glorious day. He objects ſtill. *It was in the Tenth month that they* (the Mountains) *begun to be ſeen, when the Waters were decreaſ'd; 'twas therefore the Waters, not the groſs Air, that hindred the ſight of them before.* For if *according to the method of the Excepter, the Deluge begun to decreaſe after the firſt forty days rain*, by the Sun's reſolving *waters into Vapours and Exhalations*: this, *in proportion*, muſt *leſſen the waters of the Deluge. But we do not read in* Moſes *of any abatement in the Deluge, till the end of one hundred and fifty days* (Gen. 8. 3.) *which is four Months after this term.* Nor do we imagine that there was any *conſiderable* abatement of the Waters till that time. For after the Flood was come to its height, it was neceſſary it ſhould ſtand there a good while, the better to effect that fatal deſtruction of the Animal World, for which it was ſent. Yet during the time that the Flood was thus Stationary, we ſuppoſe that GOD did work no Miracle (for we read of none) to *weaken* Nature in its force, and put by its proper Operations. And ſo the Sun, which had then a *more* than *ordinary* power upon the outragious and prevailing Waters; as ſhining

Ib. *Ib. p.* 74.

on them through a *thinner* Medium than ever yet he did; could not but turn them a *great pace* into Miſty Vapours and Exhalations. And theſe aſcending ſwiftly and copiouſly, to repleniſh the Atmoſphære ſo lately emptied by exceſſive Reſolution; might render the Mountains (as Miſts always do) quite inviſible at a little Diſtance. Yet this work being done only by Nature's hand; or, to uſe the Anſwerer's elegant ſtyle, by *the Sun's ſetting his Engines awork*; tho it was carried on for ſeveral Months, the diminution of the Waters, I ſay, might be *inconſiderable*. So inconſiderable, as not to be worth the Spirits notice. And withal ſo ineffectual, that if ſome better courſe had not been taken, the Waters would have remain'd a very long time upon the drowned Earth, beyond the hundred and fifty days mention'd, without any conſiderable degree of abatement. For if in the hundred and ten days, ſucceeding thoſe in which the rains fell, the Waters went up in miſty Vapours (towards reſtoring the Atmoſphære to its loſt Conſiſtency) in ſuch a quantity as to ſink the Flood ſuppoſe but *one* or *two* Cubits; tho this reeking evaporation might ſo darken the Air, as to hide the Mountains; yet how little would ſuch a diminution of the Deluge, be taken notice of by Heaven, or how little would it contribute to drying of the Earth? And therefore to ſpeed the work, which by the ſtrength of Nature went on but ſlowly; GOD made uſe of a certain *Wind* (*Gen.* 8. 1.) as an extraordinary Inſtrument. And by this, added at length to the Attractive influence of the Sun, the Waters aſſwaged ſo very faſt; that as the SPIRIT notes, on the firſt day of the Tenth Month the Tops of the Mountains were ſeen, *Gen.* 8. 5. And whereas the ſacred Story makes the appearance of theſe Mountain-tops, to follow the decreaſe of the Deluge-waters; nothing could be done more properly according

according to the tenour of this new Hypotheſis. For in caſe the Waters had not been decreaſed; and ſo decreaſed as to have refill'd the Atmoſphære with Vapours; and ſo decreaſed, as to have dampt the attractive power of the ſun; and ſo decreaſed, as to be drawn ſo low, and grown ſo groſs, and foul, and heavy, as to reſiſt the attenuating force of the Wind aforeſaid: theſe tops of the Mountains could not have ſhown themſelves as yet. For had not the Waters been thus decreaſed, they would ſtill have gone away into Vapours and Exhalations at ſuch a rate; as that the air by them would have been ſo bemiſted, and the Mountains by that would have been ſo obſcured, that the tops of them could not have been ſo ſoon diſcovered. And why the *tops* of them were diſcerned before their *lower* and their larger parts, an account has been already given. *Diſc. p.* 342.

Laſtly, as to this matter, he objects. *That the whole notion of ſpending the waters of the Deluge by Evaporation hath no foundation in Scripture or Reaſon* But in ſhort, it is founded upon *both.* 1ſt, Upon Reaſon. For how reaſonable is it that Waters ſhould be turned into Vapours; it being a thing moſt natural? And how reaſonable that they ſhould be ſo turned at an *extraordinary* rate, where the Sun had an extraordinary power; and when to the force of the Sun, was join'd the aſſiſtance of a mighty Wind? 2ly, Upon Scripture. For their Returning *off the Earth continually*, *Gen.* 8. 3. might be but their returning into that *Principle* out of which they were made; namely, into Vapours. And that Expreſſion, the *Waters were going and decreaſing*, *Gen.* 8. 5. may be underſtood of their going away quite by a *waſting* or diminiſhing of them. And the learned *Schindler* makes the word, הלוך, in that very place, to ſignify this very thing. And ſo the Notion was not *Anſw. p.* 74. See *Diſc. p.* 340, 341.

only founded upon Scripture, and Reaſon, but moreover upon good Authority. And whereas the Anſwerer would have the firſt of theſe two cited Texts, to denote the *local motion* of the Waters, or their *returning*

Anſw. p. 76. *to the* **place** *from whence they came*; this they *did* do when they were reſolved into Vapours, and were retracted into the Atmoſphære, whence they deſcended. Tho *ſuch* a Return they could not be ſo *fully* capable of, according to the *Theory*'s Hypotheſis; the inclos'd Abyſs being *fill'd up* in a great meaſure by the fallen Earth. And whereas he ſays farther, that then the

Ib. p. 77. *Dove's* **returning,** *was her returning into her* **principles**; *that is, into an Egg*: It is ſaid expreſsly of the Dove,

Gen. 8. 9. that *ſhe returned* **unto him** (Noah) **into the Ark**: and neither *her's*, nor the *Raven's* return into *Eggs*, could have been agreeable to *Nature*, or *Reaſon*, or have been of any manner of *uſe*. Tho as nothing was more *rational*, and nothing more *natural*; ſo nothing could poſſibly be more *uſeful* than the *Evaporation* of the Waters; both to the Earth and Atmoſphære at once. For by their thus returning, or going away into *Vapours*, the one was dried by their reaſcending the other. And ſo whereas he demands, concerning the *Evaporation* of the Waters, *where does he find this notion in Scripture?* (Anſw. p. 74.) I might better put the like queſtion to *him*; where does he in Scripture find the *vital Aſſertions* of his Theory? Which yet for the relation it has to Scripture, he calls, *Theoria ſacra, the holy Theory*; tho in ſundry things, it be inconſiſtent with Scripture and oppoſite to it.

I muſt take my leave of this point, with remarking

Another Untruth. an *Untruth* which he lays upon the Excepter: It is this. *He gives him* (the Sun) *a* **miraculous** *power to*

Anſw. p. 73. li. 24. *draw up waters.* But where does he aſcribe ſuch a power to him? The Anſwerer muſt ſhow it, or elſe incur

incur the Cenſure of a falſe Accuſer. Indeed that the Sun has power to exhale Water now, by agitating its Particles, and ſo dilating and putting them into a flying motion; is not to be doubted. Nor is it to be queſtion'd but this his power of Exhalation was moſt operative, juſt after the full Riſe of the Deluge. For then the Atmoſphære having newly ſuffered a thorow Solution of its Continuity, and the ſtock of its Vapours being greatly exhauſted; and the whole Earth, except the higher parts of the Mountains, being covered with the Flood; his Beams, having now a freer Paſſage through a finer Air, could not but ſhoot down much more forcibly upon the diffuſed Water, and agitating it more vehemently, make Vapours to riſe at a far greater Rate than they us'd to do. And theſe Vapours being once raiſed by the action of the Sun, would immediately take wing and fly into the empty Atmoſphære above, there being ſuch room and reception for them. And as faſt as ſome gave way, others following, while the void Atmoſphære ſuckt them up as it were, and helpt them to aſcend by its readineſs to receive them; an exceſſive plenty of miſty Vapours muſt needs go up, in continued ſtreams, from the ſteaming ſurface of the rarefying Water. Thus, I confeſs, the Sun had power to draw up Water, and power to attract it *very copiouſly* at the time we ſpeak of, till confuſed Nature came to be reſettled in its firſt Order. Yea, ſo plentifully did he draw up Water in that juncture, and ſuch a miſtineſs thereby did he cauſe in the Air; as he never did do before, nor never (in likelihood) ſhall do again; becauſe there never was, nor will be the like reaſons for it. But that the Excepter gave him *miraculous* power to do it, is incumbent upon the Anſwerer, who was pleas'd to ſay it, to make it out. A miraculous *Wind* indeed the Excepter owned, *Dſc. p.* 341.

ſent

ſent on purpoſe to haſten the work of drying up the Water, *Gen.* 8. 1. which in courſe of Nature could never have been done in ſo ſhort a time, if it could have been done at all: but as for a miraculous influence of the Sun, as it would have been needleſs in conjunction with ſuch a Wind, ſo he knows of none, nor did he ever think of any.

Hic ventus non tam naturali, quam divina vi ſiccavit aquas. aLapide *in loc.*

But beſides all this, at length he would find out an Inſufficiency in the new Hypotheſis; as if the meaſure of its Waters could not reach to the Execution, which was neceſſary to be done upon the Animal World. For whereas an *Univerſal Deſtruction* was made by the Flood; *I would gladly know*, ſays he, *how this could be in a fifteen-Cubit Deluge. For Birds would naturally fly to the tops of Trees. And Beaſts would retire by degrees to Mountains. Men* alſo *could not fail to retire into Mountains.* Or *the upper ſtories of their houſes might be ſufficient to ſave them.* Or *an houſe ſeated upon an Eminency, or a Caſtle upon a Rock, would always be a ſafe retreat from this diminutive Deluge.* And *thoſe that were upon the Sea, in Ships, would never come in danger.* This is the ſubſtance of the Anſwerers Objections, where he reflects upon the incompetency of the new Hypotheſis, in regard of the Quantity or height of thoſe Waters of which it ſuppoſes the flood to be made. But how eaſily are they taken off? For the common unmountainous Surface of the Earth, being by neceſſary and providential contrivance, made inequal: hence it will follow, that when the Waters were *fifteen Cubits* higher than the *higheſt parts* of that *common Surface* (which is the Fundamental Aſſertion of the new Hypotheſis) they might be forty, or fifty, or an hundred, or two hundred Cubits higher than the *general ordinary Plain* of the Earth. And when fifteen Cubits Water above the higheſt parts of the Earths common ſurface, would drown

Anſw. p. 71.

Ib. 72.

See Diſc. p. 301.

drown the Level of it generally to ſo prodigious a pitch; inſtead of a *diminutive* (as the Anſwerer calls it) here muſt be a moſt dreadful and deſtructive Deluge, both to Mankind and all Living Creatures. For put caſe that the *Birds*, upon the riſe of the waters, flew unto trees; yet where are the trees whoſe tops are an hundred or two hundred Cubits high? Or ſay, the tops of ſome trees ſtood out of the Waters, as growing upon the *higheſt parts* of the Earth's common Surface: yet could the poor Fowls be able to rooſt there, during the time of the whole forty days Rain; and then on to the end of the Flood? And grant that *Men* and *Beaſts* retired to the Mountains, when the Waters began to ſwell and threaten them: Yet then they were *great* Mountains to which they betook themſelves, or elſe they were *leſſer* ones. If they were great ones, they could not run to a more *improper Refuge*. If they were leſſer ones, how could they poſſibly ſubſiſt there, without Shelter or Suſtenance, till the Deluge was drawn off, and the Earth dried up? And the like may be ſaid of thoſe in the *upper Stories* of their houſes. Admit that the Flood did not reach them; yet how could they live there, to come down again at laſt, when their Domeſtick Stores, in their Cellars *&c.* were all overflowed, and were ſo to continue for a great while? And as for them in *Caſtles*, and *high ſituate Habitations*, if any were ſeated above the Water-mark of the Deluge; how could they ſhift for food and fewel, and keep themſelves from famiſhing for a year together? For either they were well furniſht with Proviſions, or they were not. If they were not, they could not hold out. If they were, it was becauſe a number was to be maintain'd by them. And *many* will as ſoon devour *much*; as a *few* ſpend a *little*. And where is the Caſtle, that being well ſtockt with men, as well as ſtor'd with neceſſaries (which

See *Diſc.* c. 16. §. 6.

(which commonly go together) does not fall into want before a year comes about, where there is no kind of Forage, or proviſionary Recruits? And therefore theſe Caſtles on Rocks, as to the Anſwerer's purpoſe, are but Caſtles in the air: for being on every ſide ſo ſurrounded with water, they who were in them would be ſtarved to death. And methinks there is one thing which ſeems to inſinuate, that a good part of the Animal World might perhaps come to an end thus: By being driven to ſuch ſtreights by the overflowing waters, as to be *famiſhed* or *ſtarved* to death. The thing is this. Tho the Inſtrument of Vengeance upon the wicked World was an Univerſal Flood; and tho the proper way of that Inſtrument's killing, is by *drowning*: yet in all the ſacred ſtory of the Deluge, it is no where ſaid of men and living creatures, טבעו, they were *drowned*; but all-a-long, מתו, they *died*, וימחו, and they were *deſtroyed*. As if the SPIRIT would give us to underſtand, that all the living Creatures which periſht at the Flood, were not directly *overwhelm'd* and *abſorpt* by it; but by means of its Waters were forced to *die*, very many of them, and were fearfully deſtroyed ſome *other* way; even that which we have hinted. And then laſtly as to *Ships*, I will not *deny* that there were *any* before the Flood; (for all I find *Hornius* does it poſitively in his *Introduction*; Noachi *ævo nullæ adhuc naves*; *in* Noah's *Age there were not as yet any ſhips*: tho could we allow them, at the Deluge, to be as *good* as ours, which are the beſt in the World; yet the perſons in them at that time, muſt needs be in moſt imminent Dangers. For at firſt, for forty days together, they were to ſail in darkneſs. And after that, for ſeveral Months, in ſuch ſoggy Miſts, as obſcured the Tops of the vaſteſt Mountains. By the increaſe of the Waters alſo the whole World became one boundleſs Ocean. And the

the Sea, by that means, having loſt its Shores, the Mariners skill would be ſtrangely loſt or non-pluſt too. For inſtead of finding the Seas in their uſual Figures and Chanels, and of making their Ports, at the wonted places and Diſtances; wild Waters would lead them into unknown Rodes, and trapan them on to land. And *there* being Rocks in great plenty to ſplit them, Hills to ſtave them, Banks to ſtrand them, Buildings to annoy them, Woods and Forreſts to hamper and intangle them: their dangers being new, they could not apprehend them; and being ſo many, and various, and unexpected, how could they avoid them? And then we muſt conſider farther yet, that *Shipping*, at the Flood, was very far ſhort of that *ſtrength* and *perfection*, which now it has attain'd to. The firſt conſiderable Veſſel that we read of, I think, was the *Argo*. And indeed ſome neceſſary Appendages of a Ship, were not found out, till about the time that ſhe was equip'd for *Colchis*. For famous *Dædalus*, who invented the *Maſt* and *Main-yard*; and his Son *Icarus*, who invented the *Sails*; lived then. *Typhis* alſo, who invented the *Rudder*, was one of thoſe Heroes which attended *Jaſon*, when the young Gallants of *Theſſaly*, or the flower of its Nobility, went along with him in the *Argonautick* Expedition. And yet this Ship, as *Pliny* tells us, in the Six and fiftieth Chapter of the Seventh Book of his *Natural Hiſtory*; was but a *Gally*. And he adds (which it will not be wide of our purpoſe to recite) That **Troughs** or **flat Planks** *were uſed by King* Erythras *to croſs from one Iſland to another in the Red Sea.* That *in the* Britiſh *Ocean were made certain* **Wicker-Boats** *of twigs covered with Leather, and ſtitcht* round about. *In* Nilus, Boats *of* **Paper**, **Cane-reed**, and **Ruſhes**. That *the* Erythræans *made the* Bireme, *or Gally with two Banks of Oars.* Aminacles *the* Corinthi-

(which commonly go together) does not fall into want before a year comes about, where there is no kind of Forage, or proviſionary Recruits? And therefore theſe Caſtles on Rocks, as to the Anſwerer's purpoſe, are but Caſtles in the air: for being on every ſide ſo ſurrounded with water, they who were in them would be ſtarved to death. And methinks there is one thing which ſeems to inſinuate, that a good part of the Animal World might perhaps come to an end thus: By being driven to ſuch ſtreights by the overflowing waters, as to be *famiſhed* or *ſtarved* to death. The thing is this. Tho the Inſtrument of Vengeance upon the wicked World was an Univerſal Flood; and tho the proper way of that Inſtrument's killing, is by *drowning*: yet in all the ſacred ſtory of the Deluge, it is no where ſaid of men and living creatures, טבעו, they were *drowned*; but all-a-long, מתו, they *died*, וימחו, and they were *deſtroyed*. As if the SPIRIT would give us to underſtand, that all the living Creatures which periſht at the Flood, were not directly *overwhelm'd* and *abſorpt* by it; but by means of its Waters were forced to *die*, very many of them, and were fearfully deſtroyed ſome *other* way; even that which we have hinted. And then laſtly as to *Ships*, I will not *deny* that there were *any* before the Flood; (for all I find *Hornius* does it poſitively in his *Introduction*; Noachi *ævo nullæ adhuc naves*; *in* Noah's *Age there were not as yet any ſhips*: tho could we allow them, at the Deluge, to be as *good* as ours, which are the beſt in the World; yet the perſons in them at that time, muſt needs be in moſt imminent Dangers. For at firſt, for forty days together, they were to ſail in darkneſs. And after that, for ſeveral Months, in ſuch ſoggy Miſts, as obſcured the Tops of the vaſteſt Mountains. By the increaſe of the Waters alſo the whole World became one boundleſs Ocean. And the

the Sea, by that means, having loſt its Shores, the Mariners skill would be ſtrangely loſt or non-pluſt too. For inſtead of finding the Seas in their uſual Figures and Chanels, and of making their Ports, at the wonted places and Diſtances; wild Waters would lead them into unknown Rodes, and trapan them on to land. And *there* being Rocks in great plenty to ſplit them, Hills to ſtave them, Banks to ſtrand them, Buildings to annoy them, Woods and Forreſts to hamper and intangle them: their dangers being new, they could not apprehend them; and being ſo many, and various, and unexpected, how could they avoid them? And then we muſt conſider farther yet, that *Shipping*, at the Flood, was very far ſhort of that *ſtrength* and *perfection*, which now it has attain'd to. The firſt conſiderable Veſſel that we read of, I think, was the *Argo*. And indeed ſome neceſſary Appendages of a Ship, were not found out, till about the time that ſhe was equip'd for *Colchis*. For famous *Dædalus*, who invented the *Maſt* and *Main-yard*; and his Son *Icarus*, who invented the *Sails*; lived then. *Typhis* alſo, who invented the *Rudder*, was one of thoſe Heroes which attended *Jaſon*, when the young Gallants of *Theſſaly*, or the flower of its Nobility, went along with him in the *Argonautick* Expedition. And yet this Ship, as *Pliny* tells us, in the Six and fiftieth Chapter of the Seventh Book of his *Natural Hiſtory*; was but a *Gally*. And he adds (which it will not be wide of our purpoſe to recite) That **Troughs** or **flat Planks** *were uſed by King* Erythras *to croſs from one Iſland to another in the Red Sea.* That *in the* Britiſh *Ocean were made certain* **Wicker-Boats** *of twigs covered with Leather, and ſtitcht* round about. *In* Nilus, Boats *of* **Paper**, **Cane-reed**, and **Rushes**. That *the* Erythræans *made the* Bireme, *or Gally with two Banks of Oars.* Aminacles *the* Corinthi-

an, *the firſt* Trireme. *The* Carthaginians, *the* Quadrireme. Neſichton *the* Salaminian, *the firſt* Quinquereme. And ſo they were raiſed, by *Zenagoras* of *Syracuſe*, by *Mneſigeton*, by *Alexander* the great, by *Ptolomy Soter*, by *Demetrius* Son of *Antigonus*, by *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, and by *Ptolomy Philopater*, till they came to *fifty* Banks or Courſes of Oars on a ſide. So that here we have an account of Two things not unworthy of our notice. The Firſt is *the low*, and *mean*, and *rude* **Beginnings** *of Shipping*. In ſome places it commenc'd in *Troughs* or *Hollowed trees*. So it did in *E-*
Lib. 36. c. 40. *gypt*; and as this ſame Writer tells us, Pyrates on the Coaſts of *Germany*, made ſome of theſe *Trunks* ſo large, that they would carry thirty men. And where they had not Inſtruments fit for the Excavation of theſe trees; we muſt conclude it was done by fire. In other places it began in *Wicker Sciphs*, covered with Leather well ſticht together. So it did here in our Country. For *Cæſar* in his Commentaries ſays thus of the *Britiſh* ſhips. *Their Keels and Footſtocks were made of light timber, but the reſt of their body was covered with Hides, and made of Oſiers wrought together.* Nor were the *Venetians* Ships, any better than the *Britains*, if we may take *Lucan's* word for it.

Carinæ primum ac ſtatumina ex levi materia fiebant: reliquum corpus navium viminibus contextum coriis integebatur. De Bello Civil. l. 1.

Primùm cana Salix madefacto Vimine parvam
Texerat in puppim, cæſoq; induta juvenco
Victoris patiens, tumidum ſuperenatat amnem.
Sic *Venetus* ſtagnante *Pado*, fuſoq; *Britannus*
Navigat Oceano.

A Ship firſt made of moiſt hoar Willow twiggs,
And cover'd with a Bullocks Hide;
Tho ſmall it be, when it the Maſter riggs,
Doth on the ſwelling River ride.

Thus

Thus the Venetian *ſails on the ſmooth* Po,
And Britains *on vaſt Ocean go.*

In other places again, it began in *Ruſhen*, or *Reeden Canoes*, and the Veſſels they uſed, were *Paper* things, even in the very letter. So it was upon the *Nile*. And Scripture tells us of Ambaſſadors being ſent upon negotiations, בכלי גמא *in veſſels of Bul-ruſhes*, *Iſai.* 18. 2.

The Second thing worthy of remark, is *that degree of* **Perfection** *to which Shipping arrived.* And as our aforeſaid Author informs us, it was grown up no higher than to great *Gallies* in *Ptolomy Philopator's* time. And he reigning after the Year of the World 3750; *this* World had then ſtood near five hundred years longer than *that* before the Flood. And whereas he affirms the firſt *Quadrireme* to be built by the *Carthaginians*; we muſt conſider that *Carthage* it ſelf was not built till *An. Mun.* 3080. So that if we allow that Commonwealth but 150 years to ſettle in, and to improve in mechanical Attainments, and in *Ship-Carpentry*, for one: Then if we reckon (which is no ill way of counting) that the firſt World made equal proficience in the ſame Art with this latter, in proportion to its ſtanding; it might ſo be furniſht with ſuch kind of Gallies as the *Carthaginians* were, juſt a little before the Deluge. But then they ſeem to have been Veſſels not over *ſtrong*. Nor indeed is it poſſible that Ships in thoſe days, ſhould be of any *great ſtrength*, if we conſider with what *ſtrange Expedition* they were built. For as that excellent Hiſtorian *Florus* tells us, a Navy of the *Romans* of an hundred and ſixty Ships (in the time of the firſt *Punic* War) was ſet out and lay at anchor, *intra ſexageſimum diem*; **within ſixty days** after the timber they were made of, was cut down in the wood. Inſomuch that they might ſeem to be *non arte factæ*; not framed

Vid. *Helvic. Theatr. Hiſtor.*

Id. ib.

Lib. 2. *cap.* 2.

by art, *ſed quodam munere Deorum*, &c. but by a certain favour of the GODS, turned out of trees into Ships. And yet that they were as *ſtrong* as any that the *Carthaginians*, or that the King of *Syracuſe*, their Confederate, had; the event proved. For then it was that *Duilius* the *Roman* Admiral, ſo *quickly* overcame that Prince, that he confeſſed he was conquered before he ſaw the Enemy. And having broken in pieces, and put to flight the Fleet at *Lipara*, he was the firſt that was honoured with a Sea-triumph, as the ſame Writer ſays. Adding withal, that for this he triumphed every day; never at any time returning from ſupper without Torches and Muſick before him. Nor is *Florus* alone in reporting the ſtrange and wonderful *celerity*, wherewith the *Romans* of old builded their ſhips. *Pliny* joins with him; and teſtifies that in the ſecond *Punic* War, the Armado which *Scipio* commanded, was under ſail *within forty days* after the timber was felled, whereof it was made. And acquaints us farther, that *L. Piſo* left it in writing, that againſt King *Hiero*, two hundred and twenty Ships were built and furniſht, *within five and forty days* after the timber grew. Surely theſe could be no very ſtout or *ſtrong* Ships. And yet, I ſay, they matched the ſtrongeſt in the World. For the only Commonwealth which could then pretend to cope with *Rome*, was that of *Carthage*. And indeed with *Rome* it did contend in two very ſharp and tedious Wars (tho it fell in the third) the firſt holding four and twenty years, and the ſecond, eighteen; between which, ſays *Florus*, there was *vix quadriennis requies*, ſcarce four years reſpite. And *Carthage* being built by the *Tyrians*, or at leaſtwiſe peopled with a Colony of *Phœnicians*, who were ever well skill'd in Sea affairs, and eminent in Shipping: This City being older than *Rome** ſeventy two years, and mighty powerful;

Nat. Hiſt. l. 16. c. 39.

**Condita eſt urbs hæc* LXXII. *annis antequam* Roma Juſtin. lib. 18.

erful; was the moſt likely of all other, to exceed *Rome* in Naval force. Yet ſo far was it from doing this, that the *Carthaginians* were frequently vanquiſht by the *Romans*, in Sea Ingagements. Particularly in that which the incomparable *Livy* gives account of; when the *Roman* Fleet put to flight that of *Carthage*, and took ſeven of their Ships, *extemplò*, as his word is, even *immediately*. And yet thoſe Ships were not ſo inconſiderable, but in them were taken ſeventeen hundred Souldiers. And when they had done that (as he continues the ſtory) they ſailed to *Lilybæum*, or *Meſſala*, and gave their enemies Navy there a great overthrow. And when the *Romans* could thus worſt the *Carthaginians*, who had reaſon to have the beſt ſhipping; 'tis a ſign that their ſhipping was as good as theirs. But then the *Roman* Ships being ſo *haſtily* built, they could not excel in ſtrength neither. And yet at the time of the firſt *Punic* War, *this* World had ſtood four hundred years longer than the *firſt* did. And ſo we cannot imagine that the Shipping of that World, was ever better than the *Roman* ſhipping was then in this. And in caſe it was not, we have no cauſe to think, that any of its Ships could poſſibly endure and out-laſt the Flood. And truly if we look forward, we ſhall find that Ships in ſome *ſucceeding* Ages, were of no great bulk or burthen. For had they been ſo in *Julius Cæſar*'s time, (who lived about three hundred years after the *Punic* War) he needed not to have invaded *Britain* with above *eight hundred* at once, as we find he did. And therefore when we read of *Agamemnon*'s Fleet of a thouſand Sail, and of *Xerxes*'s that covered the *Helleſpont*; or the like; we need not be ſurpriz'd at the *number* of Ships, ſo we do but think of the *Dimenſions* of them. And as for thoſe which were very large and ſtrong, they ſeem to have been made for ſome *ſpecial* ſervice, and that

Hiſt. *Dec.* 3. *lib.* 1.

Commentar. lib. 5. *De. Bell. Gall.*

that being done to be uſeleſs after it; as being perhaps, too big to be manag'd in thoſe days. Such were the two wonderful ones that *Pliny* ſpeaks of, which tranſported huge Obelisks from *Egypt* to *Rome*. The firſt of them *Auguſtus* laid up in the haven of *Puteoli*, to be lookt on; where it remained till it was accidentally burnt. The ſecond, which required an hundred and twenty thouſand *Modij* of Lintels for its Ballaſt, after *Caligula* had kept it ſome years as a kind of wonder to be gaz'd at; *Claudius* cauſed it to be brought to *Oſtia*, and to be ſunk there for the ſecurity of the Harbour. But not to dwell too long upon this head.

Nat. Hiſt. l. 36. c. 9.

Id. ib. l. 16. c. 40.

If ſo be we meaſure the firſt Worlds perfection in Shipping and Navigation, by what men in this World gain'd of that nature, in the like Period of time (which I think is the beſt Rule we can go by:) we ſhall find the prædiluvians deficient *in*, yea, deſtitute *of* two moſt neceſſary things. For firſt, they had no *Anchors*. And ſecondly, they had none of the *Sea-chart* or *Compaſs*.

Εὗρε δ' ἄγκυραν τε καὶ πορπαμίον ξύλον. *Diog. Laert. in vit.*

Firſt. they could have no *Anchors*. For the Inventer of the *Anchor* (as alſo of the *Potters Wheel*) was *Anacharſis*, that noble *Scythian* (or rather that *Royal* one, for he was brother to *Caduides* the King of *Scythia*) and the only learned man and rare Philoſopher of that barbarous Country. Which gave occaſion to the Proverb, *Anacharſis* inter *Scythas*. Now he (being contemporary with *Solon*, as *Laertius* tells us) flouriſht after the year of the World 3340. For then it was that *Solon* wrote the *Athenian* Laws, toward the latter end of the Reign of *Tarquinius Priſcus*, And ſo the Anchor could not be found out, till ſuch time as this World had out-laſted the other. And conſequently, according to the beſt Meaſures we can take, the Antediluvians had no Anchors to their Ships. And

Solonem *ergo accepimus unum ex illo nobili numero ſapientum leges ſcripſiſſe* Athenienſium, Tarquinio Priſco *regnante, anno regni ejus tricesimo tertio.* Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att. lib. 17. cap. 21.*

And Secondly, by the ſame Rule, they muſt want the *Compaſs* too; that being a *much later* Invention than the Anchor. For however ſome will have it to be *ancient*, their opinion is certainly without all good grounds. As for the *Comœdians* Authority, which *Lemnius* alledges, *cape modo verſoriam*; it is of no force. For by *Verſoria*, he might mean the *Rudder* only; or as *Turnebus* expounds it, and ſome Dictionaries render the word: *funis quo vertitur velum, the Rope that turns the Sail* to the Wind-ward. Nor is there the leaſt mention made of this Compaſs (that I find) amongſt any of the Ancients, be they Philoſophers, Hiſtorians, or others. Yea, inſtead of that, divers modern Authors of note, make it the Diſcovery of latter Ages. So does *Bodinus*; *uſum ejus plane divinum Antiqui ignorarunt*: *The Ancients were ignorant of the Divine* (or excellent) *uſe of it*. And ſo does *Blondus*, in his Deſcription of *Italy*. *Certum eſt id navigandi auxilium priſcis omnino fuiſſe incognitum*: *Certain it is that help of navigating was altogether unknown to the Ancients*. *Cardan* alſo declares, *his tribus tota Antiquitas nihil par habet. All Antiquity has nothing equal to theſe three things.* Of which the *Mariners Compaſs* was one, the other two being *Guns*, and *Printing*. And therefore Voyages heretofore could be performed only by croſſing over ſome narrow Seas, or elſe by Coaſting it along by the Shores ſide, from one Country to another. And for this reaſon King *Solomon*'s Navy was three years in making a Voyage to *Ophir*; becauſe for lack of the *Compaſs* they were fain to creep along cloſe by the Shores, and durſt not venture to take a ſhorter Cut, by lanching out into the main Ocean. Nor could thoſe Glorious Voyages not long ſince made (as well by the *Engliſh* as other Nations) ever have been accompliſht, without the help of this admirable Inſtrument; which yields a moſt

De occult. Natur. Mirac. li. 3: ca. 4.

Plaut. *in Merc. Adverſ. li. 20. ca. 4.*

Method. Hiſt. cap. 7.

Ital. illuſtr. Region. 13.

De Subtil. li. 17.

moſt ſtrange direction, and thereby a ſutable ſafety unto Sailors.

And thus I think enough has been ſaid, to ſhow that the circumſtances of men *in Ships*, at the coming in of the Flood, were not only dangerous but deſperate. For if we conſider aright, that *their* ſhips were much *weaker* than *ours* are; and that thoſe weak Ships had *no Anchors*; and that they themſelves had *no Compaſs*; and that the Seas they navigated had *no Shores*, by which they uſed to ſteer their courſe: And ſo tho they could ſtop no where, yet their motion carry'd them they knew not whither; even amongſt Rocks and Cliſts, and Hills, and Mountains, and Cities, and Trees, and Villages. If this, I ſay, be rightly conſidered, we may well conclude their condition hopeleſs. And not only that all *hope* of their being ſaved was taken away, as it was from them in the Ship of *Adramyttium*, *Acts* 27. but likewiſe all *poſſibility* of their being ſo.

But if after all, any *hill*, or *Caſtle*, or *houſe*, or *Ship*, could be able to ſave any creatures from the Deluge; we need but flie to *Extraordinary Providence*, (as the Anſwerer does often) and the power of that would effectually diſpatch them. When Heaven was pleas'd to give *Satan* leave, he cauſed the fire to conſume *Job's* Sheep, and cauſed the Wind to deſtroy his Children. And how eaſily could thoſe Spirits, that are Miniſters of GOD's vengeance, have made the waters of the Flood (in that terrible day of general execution) fatal to thoſe Creatures that might have eſcap'd them, if any could have done it. For when GOD thinks fit to appoint him to the work, there's never a *one* of thoſe Spirits, but really is, (what *Homer* ſo commonly calls *Jupiter*) νεφεληγερέτης, a *Gatherer of Clouds*. And ſo with greateſt eaſe, could ſo drive, and thruſt, and ſqueeze them together; as to force them to diſcharge themſelves

ſelves in ſuch mighty Defluxions, as would not fail to drown men, and all Land-animals, in whatever Securities they were lodged.

And now (as it is high time) let us ſee what the Anſwerer ſays, to our notion of *the Fountains of the great Deep.* They are ſuppoſed to be **Caverns** *in Rocks and Mountains.* But to this notion he oppoſes, firſt, That we *alledge but one ſingle text of Scripture to ſupport it.* And is not that ſufficient to do it? How *many* Truths ſtand upon ſuch ſingle Teſtimonies? nor need they any better evidence to authenticate and confirm them. And 'twere well if every vital Aſſertion of the Theory's, had *one ſingle* text to ſupport it. And yet how eaſie were it to cite ſeveral texts of Scripture, that *fall in* moſt naturally with our ſenſe? I will inſtance but in two. *He layeth up the Deeps in treaſuries, Pſal.* 33. 7. And what could theſe אוצרות *Treaſuries* be, ſo properly, as huge *Caverns* in Rocks and Mountains; where GOD, by the hand of Nature, did of old, and ſtill does *lay up* Deep Waters? And Pro. 3. 20. GOD ſays, *by his knowledge the Depths are broken up,* or *cleaved.* And to what can this Text be applied more fitly, and of what can it be underſtood more fairly, or expounded more emphatically, than theſe Caverns? Which as they were more generally broke up at the time of the Flood, according as GOD in his Wiſdom thought fit; ſo at certain times, and in certain places, many have been cleaved or opened ſince. Sometimes miraculouſly, as in *Rephidim* and *Cadeſh*; and ſometimes otherwiſe by ordinary Providence; New Springs breaking forth and running continually out of the opened Caverns. Whence as ſome Water iſſued or flowed out? other again was ſtill generated within, by the Reſolution of Vapours drawn up from the Great Deep below, to which the Roots of many high Rocks and

Diſc. p. 303.

Anſw. p. 75.

Mountains may deſcend. Yea, if they did not go down below the *bottom* of the Deep; how could we come by the Metals that we have? Next he intimates, that the Text we alledge, has been *generally underſtood otherwiſe.* And ſo have many Texts which he alledges in favour of his Hypotheſis. And yet he thought that they might be interpreted to *his* ſenſe, and were very applicable to his purpoſe. Then he ſays, that *the Excepter, by all means, will have theſe holes in the Rocks, to be the ſame with the* Moſaical Abyſs, *or Great Deep, that was broken up at the Deluge.* This is a meaning quite beyond our intention: For we mean only this. That our Caverns were but the *fountains* of the great Deep, broken up at the Flood; not the *Great Deep* it ſelf. And this is evident from ſeveral Expreſſions; *three* of which occur in the ſame page where our Notion is delivered. *What thoſe* **Fountains** *of the Great Deep were, which at the time of the Flood were cleaved,* &c. And again, *The breaking up of the* **Fountains** *of* Tehom Rabbah, *or the great Deep (which the* Theory *inſiſts ſo much upon) was no more than the breaking up of ſuch* **Caverns**. And preſently after, *the breaking open of the* **Fountains** *of the great Deep,* Gen. 7. 11. *and the cleaving of thoſe Rocks in the Wilderneſs, Pſal.* 78. 15. *were in effect but the ſame thing.* And afterwards, *Still the great deep* **Caverns** *of the Mountains, may very well paſs for the* **Fountains** *of* Moſes's Tehom Rabbah. So that whereas it is ſaid (*p.* 312.) *ſuppoſing that the Caverns in the mountains were this great Deep,* &c. And where ſpeaking of the *Pſalmiſt*'s great *Deeps*, and *Moſes*'s great *Deep*; it is ſaid, that **the ſame thing** *might be meant by both:* it is plain that by thoſe *Caverns* and the *Pſalmiſt*'s *Great Deeps*, muſt be meant, that they were the ſame with the *Fountains* of *Moſes*'s Tehom Rabbah, or Great Deep; and not that *Great Deep* it ſelf. And whereas it is ſaid

Ib. *Ib.* 303. *li.* 2. *Li.* 8. *Li.* 20. *p.* 310. *li.* 12. *Li.* 1. *p.* 305. *li.* 30.

in

in our *Diſcourſe* (*p.* 153.) that *the great Deep, or the fountains then broken up, had no relation to the Sea*: it is to be underſtood that they had no ſuch relation to it, as that the breaking them up, ſhould occaſion *the proud waves of the Sea to paſs their bounds in making the Deluge*; the thing there ſpoken of. And laſtly tho *Moſes*'s word be *Deep*, and the *Pſalmiſt*'s word be, *Deeps*; yet as the different Numbers they uſe, need not ſet them at variance? ſo according to our meaning, they are very reconcileable. For ſuch Deeps as the Pſalmiſt mentions, were but the *fountains* of *Moſes*'s Deep; and ſo *in effect* (as was ſaid even now) *but the ſame thing*. As much the ſame, as *fountains* riſing from a Spring-head, and that *Spring-head* can be the ſame. And we may obſerve (in concent with this) that *Moſes* does not ſay that the *Great Deep* was broken up, but that the *Fountains* of the great Deep were ſo. And what *true* Fountains of the Great Deep, were our Caverns of Water? For the waters that filled them, might all be drawn up (by the influence of the Sun) *out* of *Moſes*'s Great Deep; and then when Providence cleaved theſe Caverns, and ſet them a flowing; how properly and really might it be ſaid, that *the Fountains of the Great Deep were broken up?* ſeeing *that* might be the Source, from whence originally the waters of theſe Fountains were extracted. The Anſwerer adds, that according to the Excepter, *the* Great Deep *was not one thing, or one continued Cavity, as* Moſes *repreſents it, but ten thouſand holes ſeparate and diſtant from one another.* Tho our Great Deeps were many, and ſeparate, and diſtant from one another; yet they do not hinder *Moſes*'s Great Deep, from being one continued Cavity: for ours were but the *fountains* of his. Tho enough was ſaid beſides, to take off the edge of this Objection, where we ſhewed that Scripture does uſe the ſingular and plural Num-

p. 306.

Anſw. p. 75.

Diſc. p. 305, 306

bers promiſcuouſly, ſometimes putting one for the other. Were there not above ten thouſand *Quails* about the *Hebrews* Camp, when they fell round about it as
Num. 11. 31. it were two Cubits high? Yet the Scripture ſays only, וחגב השלו, *and the* Quail *came up*, *Exod.* 16. 13. As if (as many as they were) they had been but *one*. The Anſwerer proceeds; *Neither muſt the Great Deep, according to him, ſignify a* low *place, but an* high *place. For he confeſſes theſe Caverns were higher than the common*
Anſw. p. 75. *level of the Earth.* *Moſes*'s Great Deep may lie as low as you pleaſe; But *our* Great Deeps were but as *Fountains* of his, and ſo might be as high as we plac'd them. And yet ſome of them might be full out as *deep* as the Sea it ſelf is, in moſt places, if we conſider the wonderful heighth of ſome Mountains. And ſo they might be ſtrangely *vaſt* alſo, conſidering how big ſome Mountains are. And this our notion of *the Fountains of the Great Deep* falls in moſt fairly with the Scripture Doctrine of the *Original* of Fountains. For that makes them to come from the *Sea*, or Great Abyſs; and we ſuppoſe ours to be derived from thence. Let theſe things be duly weighed, and I hope it will appear, that the Anſwerer had no reaſon at all to charge us, with
Ib. p. 76. breaking thorough *ſo many plain Texts of Scripture.* Will he who finds this great fault, be found free from the like himſelf? But here I appeal to any indifferent Judge, if our Notion of the fountains of the great Deep be not as conſonant to Scripture, as any other.

And thus we come to his concluding Objection againſt our Caverns. *What reaſon have we to believe,*
Ib. p. 77. *that there were ſuch Veſſels then, more than now?* To
Diſc. p. 306, 307, 308. this we have ſpoken ſo very fully, that nothing more needs here be added in way of reply. Who would have thought there had been ſuch fountains in the Rocks of *Rephidim* and *Cadeſh*; if God had not opened them?

But

But he draws out the Objection farther, thus. *If the opening the Abyſs at the Deluge, had been the opening of Rocks, why did not* Moſes *expreſs it ſo: and tell us, that the Rocks were cloven, and the waters guſhed out; and ſo made the Deluge; This would have been as intelligible if it had been true, as to tell us, that the* Tehom Rabbah *was broken open. But there is not one word of* Rocks, *or the* cleaving of Rocks, *in the Hiſtory of the Flood.* To which we reply, firſt; *Moſes* does not ſay, that the *Tehom Rabbah* was broken open, but only the *fountains* of it were broken up. And what *fountains* belonging to the *Tehom Rabbah*, could more properly be ſo broken up, than theſe Caverns? Secondly, the *Intelligibility* of a thing, is no reaſon why it muſt needs be expreſſed. How many things are paſſed by with ſilence in Scripture, even where occaſion is offered to ſpeak of them; which yet are true, and had they been expreſſed, might eaſily have been underſtood? And thirdly, the ſame Objection which he throws at the Excepter; rebounds back with violence upon himſelf. If the breaking up of the Abyſs, at the Deluge, had been *the Diſruption and fall of the Earth into the Abyſs which lay under it* (according to the Vital Aſſertion of the Theory, in that caſe;) why did not *Moſes* expreſs it ſo: and tell us that this *Diſruption* and *Fall of the Earth into the Abyſs which lay under it*, made the Deluge? This would have been as intelligible, if it had been true, as to tell us that the *Fountains of the Tehom Rabbah were broken up.* But there is not one word of this *Fall of the Earth*, in the Hiſtory of the Flood. *Anſw. p. 77.*

Thus have we ſeen the Aſſaults that are made upon the new Hypotheſis for the Explication of the Deluge: But ſo far are they from overthrowing it, that they ſeem to me, not to ſhake it in the leaſt. And I cannot but own, that I am never ſo inclinable to believe it may be true,

true, as when I conſider how weak the anſwers are to the reaſons and arguments alledg'd to confirm it; and how inconſiderable the Objections againſt it. But yet I do no more affirm it to be true *now*, than I did at *firſt*. Tho I am apt to think it may as well paſs for true, and may as eaſily be maintained to be true, as that Hypotheſis to which it is compared, and which arrogates to it ſelf, the glorious Title, not only of a **true** *piece of Natural Hiſtory*; but alſo of *the* **greateſt** *and* **moſt remarkable,** *that hath yet been* **ſince the beginning of the World.**

CHAP. XVI.

THE principal matter, and the only thing to be noted in this Chapter; is what our Author omitted in its proper place, and is here thought on by him to be anſwered. According to his uſual way of
Anſw. p. 78. miſtaking, he calls it *one objection*, tho there be *two* very
Diſc. p. 311. diſtinct ones. He anſwers the laſt firſt, and therefore I begin with that, which was this. *If the Abyſs under the Earth* (to wave the other things mention'd) *had been the great Deep meant by* Moſes; *it had not had any* **true** *or* **proper Fountains** *in it*. And ſo what will become of **all the Fountains** *of the great Deep*? His
Anſw. p. 78. Anſwer is, *there were fountains in the Abyſs, as much as Windows in Heaven.* The word, ארבות, rendred, *Windows*; ſignifies as well, *Cataracts*; and it might have been rendred ſo more properly. And indeed in the Margent, *Gen.* 7. 11. it is rendred, *Floodgates*; which in ſignification is ſomewhat nearer to, *Cataracts* Tho *that*, I ſay, would have been the *propereſt* reddition in this Text. For *Cataracts* are high and broken places, from whence waters do impetuouſly ruſh down. And therefore thick, and broken Clouds, condenſed into

into hardneſs or an Icy conſiſtency, from which, prodigious waters, (by falls from one concameration of them to another) came tumbling down in exceſſive quantities, and at laſt were diſcharged hideouſly on the Earth, in many places, eſpecially about the lofty Mountains; were at that time *true cæleſtial Cataracts*, which by ALMIGHTY GOD were then *opened* even in a literal ſenſe. And therefore theſe Cataracts (or *Windows of Heaven*) by ſome learned Commentators, are expounded to be, *Nubes denſæ & Copioſæ; thick and huge Clouds.* But now in the inclos'd Abyſs, there were no *anſwerable* Fountains broken up; no ſuch *real* Fountains, as theſe were **real** *Cataracts of Heaven*: and therefore the Anſwer given, is not home to the purpoſe.

The other Objection was this. Whereas it is ſaid, *Gen.* 8. 2. *That* the Fountains of the Deep were ſtopped: *the Earth broken down into the Abyſs was never* made up *again.* He anſwers; *thoſe were ſhut up; that is, ceas'd to act, and were put into a condition to continue the Deluge no longer.* But then if the *Stoppage* of theſe Fountains was *Figurative*, the Fountains themſelves muſt be the ſame. And ſo they were not ſo *real* as the Cataracts of Heaven were. Nor could they be *ſtopped* ſo *properly* as our Caverns might be: the thing that we argued for, and the driſt of our Objection was to make it out. And as for this anſwer, it rather ſtrengthens the Objection, than takes it off. *Diſc. p.* 311. *Anſw. p.* 78.

CHAP. XVII.

IN juſtification of that *Poſitiveneſs* wherewith he was charged; in the beginning of this Chapter, he makes profeſſion of his *belief* of the Theory. And let them that can do it, envy him the ſatisfaction and benefit of it. But if he has no better proofs of its certainty, than

than what he has produced; when by his faith he apprehends it for a *Reality*, he may do no better than *he* did, who embrac'd a ſhadow for the Goddeſs. There are many thouſands, and they not unlearned, who take Legends, for truths; and equal Tradition to the written Word. Who put Apocryphal Books into the holy Canon; and give fulleſt aſſent to that pregnant abſurdity, the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. But this is ſo far from changing the Nature of the things, that it only betrays the folly of the Perſons. For it evidently ſhews the blindneſs of their Minds, that they are ſo ſtrangely impos'd on; and the weakneſs of their Judgments, that can be led captive into ſuch groſs and groundleſs Errors. And from theſe and other Inſtances we may infer; that a ſtrong faith and confident aſſurance, may be no arguments of the objects truth; but of the Believers Credulity. It is a notable word that *Demoſthenes* ſpake in his Third Oration to the *Olynthians*. *'Tis eaſieſt of all to deceive ones ſelf; For that which every one wills, he phantſies*, is: *But the nature of thinzs is often otherwiſe.* The eloquent Man gave this hint in *another* Caſe: but it is not inapplicable to *that* in hand. Our Anſwerer believes his Theory to be true. But may he not here practiſe that upon himſelf, which is ſo eaſie to be done? The Man that would fain have a thing be real, will ſoon believe it is ſo; ſtrong inclination being equivalent to evidence. And (which we may well wonder at) as one ſymptom of the ſtrong faith he has for his Hypotheſis; he declares, that his believing his Theory to be *no more than a Romance or phantaſtical Idea*, would be *both to bely his own Conſcience, and to mock the World.* Now in ſhort, if his Theory be *not* true, it is but a *Romance* or *phantaſtic Idea.* And if it *be* true, I ſpeak it with reverence, the HOLY GHOST, the SPIRIT of truth, muſt be no lon-

Ῥᾷον ἀπάντων ὄξιν αὐτὸν ἐξαπατῆσαι. ὃ γὰρ βούλεται, τοῦθ' ἕκαστος καὶ οἴεται. Τὰ δὲ πράγματα πολλάκις ἐκ ἄπω πίπτει.

See *Diſc.* p. 358.

ger

ger ſo; and GOD did moſt certainly *mock the World*, the thing which our Anſwerer is aſham'd to do. For He granted to *Adam*, and his Off-ſpring, a *Dominion over the Fiſh of the Sea*, as well as over the Fowls of the Air, and the Beaſts of the Earth: and the H. GHOST recorded as much, *Gen.* 1. 28. But when GOD paſſed that Grant to *Adam* and his Poſterity; if there was no Sea nor Fiſh, for him, or them, to command, or come at, in the Primitive Earth; muſt not this be down right *Mocking* of the firſt World? And yet if he did *not* paſs that Grant, the H. GHOST, for recording it *done*, muſt be as was ſaid, and what I love not to repeat. Tho at laſt this Grant could never paſs and take place, unleſs the Theory be a *Romance* and *phantaſtic Idea*. For it aſſerts expreſly of the firſt Earth, that it was *without a Sea*. Yea, this is put amongſt its *Vital* aſſertions, and therefore if it fails, the Theory *dies*, and the whole Hypotheſis is ruin'd at once. But how much better is it, that this *piece of Natural Hiſtory* (as *true*, and *great*, and *remarkable* as it is, in its Authors eſteem) ſhould prove a *Romance*; than that any piece of the *Divine Hiſtory* ſhould prove an untruth; and the H. GHOST, and the HOLY GOD ſhould be ſuppos'd to do ſuch unworthy things, as would mightily diſgrace any honeſt man. The next Paſſage that preſents it ſelf to notice, is this. *I remember I have heard a good Author once wiſh, that there were an* Act of Parliament, *that whoever Printed a Book, ſhould, when he took a Licenſe, ſwear, that he thought the* Contents of his Book to be true, *as to the ſubſtance. And I think ſuch a method would keep off a great many impertinencies.* Had our Honourable Senate a power to over-rule the minds of men, and to enact that none ſhould *think* things true, which in themſelves are falſe; I doubt not but they would ſoon ſecure us by Law, from erroneous impertinencies: Ib:

tinencies. But ſo long as Authors can *believe* their Writings, and *think* them *true*; when if they *be* ſo, even in the *ſubſtance* of them, the Word from Heaven muſt be falſe: There is little hope that the wiſhed *Act* impoſing ſuch an Oath, ſhould be an effectual Expedient. However it might keep off *ſome* impertinent errors, *many* would come on; and the *greateſt* and *moſt remarkable Natural Hiſtory*, would have been a proof and pregnant exemplification of as much; had ſuch an *Act* been paſſed.

After this, he compares his own *Poſitiveneſs*, with my *Partiality*: Wiſhing the Excepter had not more to *anſwer for*, as to that; than the Theoriſt hath for the other. Here I am moſt ready to *join Iſſue* with him, and to go to Trial immediately at any Bar. And let the Judge be even who he will, ſo he be no more partial, than the Excepter has been. Then I ſhall fear neither his Examination, nor yet his Sentence: let the one be as ſtrict, and the other as ſevere, as Juſtice can make them. Then he comes upon us with a double charge, as if we had fail'd in the *Sincerity*, and alſo in
Ib. the *Meekneſs*, which we promiſed to uſe. But 'tis a ſign he wants matter for accuſation, when he is fain to make theſe things Inſtances of it. As to failing in *Sincerity*, tho the charge be heavy; the Proofs of it (for our comfort) are light enough. For they are only *defective and partial Citations*; and our *not taking notice of the laſt Edition of the Theory*: to which we have ſufficiently anſwered already, that is, in the laſt Paragraph ſave one, of the ſeventh Chapter of this Reply. But his purſuing us thus with this clamour, of our *not taking notice of his laſt Edition*; minds me of what a certain Friend did once ſuggeſt. Who obſerving how many *particulars* were *left out* of that Edition, which were cenſured in my *Exceptions*; and underſtanding that thoſe *Exceptions* in writing, were about the Town (where

(where at laſt they were printed) for above a year and half together at one time, long before his Edition came forth: would fain perſwade me, that during that time, my Exceptions ſtraggled into the Theoriſt's hands; or that by one or other he was made *acquainted* with them; and ſo ſhifted as many of his Errors as he conveniently could, out of the way, as being ſenſible they could not bear that blow, which he foreſaw was coming. Our want of *Meekneſs*, is a new crimination; and he proves it by this *fierce Charge*, as he calls it, in our *Preface*. The *Theoriſt hath aſſaulted Religion, and that in the very foundation of it*. If any thing like *fierceneſs* can be found here; it muſt be *forced* out of the *form* of the words. And *that*, I do declare, is not owing in the leaſt to any heat of Spirit; but meerly to the *real truth* of the Matter, which in other terms, could not be better expreſt. For I hope it will be granted, that holy Scripture is the *Foundation* of our Religion. And then, of neceſſity, *Contradicting* Scripture, muſt be *aſſaulting* that Foundation. And there was no more of Fierceneſs, (let him aſſure himſelf,) than there is of Falſeneſs, in our Aſſertion. But I plainly ſee, that he who touches a Sore, tho with greateſt tenderneſs, and with no other intention than purely to heal it; muſt have hard words, as well as heavy complaints, from the Party affected. But this charge, it ſeems, ran too high. For *here*, ſays *Ibi.* he, *I expected to have found two or three Articles of the Creed aſſaulted or knockt down by the Theory*. I muſt tell him freely (and I do it meekly) that contradicting Scripture (the burthen of our charge) is the readieſt way not only to knock down *two* or *three*; but even *all* the Articles of the Creed at once. Undermining the Foundation, muſt needs ſink the whole Building. But what courſe does the Doctor take, to free himſelf from this Charge; which becauſe it lies *juſtly* againſt him,

lies *heavy* upon him? Why, he makes Two faint Offers
Ib. p. 81. at removing it. The firſt is this. *Let us remember, that this contradicting Scripture, here pretended, is only in natural things.* And is his contradicting Scripture then, but *pretended* only? I heartily wiſh, for his ſake, that it were ſo. But what is ſaid in the Eighth Chapter of this Reply, makes it *too real* and *apparent*. To extenuate it therefore, he here *remembers us*, that his contradicting Scripture, *is only in natural things*. And now I muſt confeſs my ſelf to be at a ſtand. I have often been ſurpriz'd at occurrencies in his Writings; but now I am almoſt amaz'd: To ſee that ſo wild a word as this, ſhould come from the Pen of a Chriſtian Doctor. That he ſhould alledge for himſelf, as a kind of defence, that he contradicted Scripture *only in natural things*. As if when the H. SPIRIT ſpake of *ſuch* things, he did not mind what it was he ſaid; or men might interpret it even as they liſt, and turn it to a contrary meaning if they pleaſe, without offence. As if it were lawful in ſome things to give GOD the lie, ſo we but allow him to ſpeak truth in others. Believe it, I take no pleaſure at all in theſe expreſſions; but yet I cannot forbear neither, to think the Oracles of Heaven ſhould be thus treated. I formerly minded him of *too bold an affront to Scripture*, and how he might approach towards another enormity: and, GOD knows, I did it in meekneſs and kindneſs. And however it was taken, 'tis now
81. plain, it was neceſſary. For in that very page where he reflects on thoſe things; he runs unhappily into this *new* exorbitance, of excuſing his *contradicting* Scripture, by ſaying he did it *only in natural things*. As he bids *us* remember this, ſo I hope *he* will remember it *ſeriouſly*. Elſe by the memento he here puts in, he will but heat a Brand as it were, to mark himſelf for extravagance. And truly admit but this *one* Extravagance

of

of *contradicting Scripture* in *natural* things: and it will draw ſuch a *number* of *others* after it, and thoſe ſo notorious; that no tongue can be able either to reckon them up, or repreſent them. It would even match the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; that *Hydra* of nonſenſical errors, and monſtrous Jargon of abſurdities. As a ſpecimen of this, take what follows. From the very beginning, as Scripture aſſures us, the Sun ſhone in the Heavens; the Light filled the Air; and Day and Night were alternately on the Earth. But theſe were *Natural things*; and may we venture therefore to contradict Scripture in them, and ſay they were not ſo? Then how could the World poſſibly ſubſiſt? As Scripture informs us, the Ground yielded trees, and trees brought forth fruits, and of one ſort of fruit did our firſt Parents eat (tho it was forbidden them.) But theſe were *Natural things*; and may we therefore preſume to contradict Scripture, and deny that they were thus? Then how came theſe Products into being, which gave occaſion to the ſin and fall of man? As Scripture inſtructs us, *Adam* begat ſome Children, and they begat others, and they again others, and ſo on. But theſe Generations were *Natural things*; and may we therefore take upon us to contradict Scripture, and ſay there was no ſuch way of propagation? Then how could Mankind be increas'd and multipli'd? As Scripture teaches us, the Body of our LORD was fleſh and blood. But fleſh and blood are *Natural things*; and may we therefore be ſo bold as to contradict Scripture, and ſay that his body was not carnal? Then how can his blood cleanſe us from our ſins? or how ſhall we ever be ſaved by his Croſs? And when to ſuch a monſtrous and miſchievous pitch of abſurdity, *contradicting Scripture in* Natural *things*, would riſe; this aloud proclaims it to be an evil practice, and a method too licentious,

tious, to be allowable. And farther; *Natural* things may be *matter* of *divine Declarations* and *Promiſes* in Scripture. And when they are ſo, to contradict Scripture, by ſaying they are *otherwiſe* than that *declares* or *promiſes* they ſhould be; muſt be indirect impeachment of the Truth, Fidelity, and Righteouſneſs of Heaven. Thus, for example, it was of old *declar'd* or *promis'd* to *Noah*, that *while the Earth continueth, ſeed-time, and harveſt, and ſummer, and winter, ſhall not ceaſe*, Gen. 8. 22. But therefore ſhould we ſay that theſe various Seaſons ſhall not be conſtant, and run parallel with this Earthly Worlds exiſtence; but ſhall either be ſuſpended by diſcontinuance or interruption; or elſe ceaſe by præmature abolition or expiration: by contradicting Scripture in theſe tempeſtival *Natural* Viciſſitudes, we ſhould break in too rudely upon GOD's moſt glorious Attributes aforeſaid. We may very eaſily bring this home, to the *Dominion* over the Fiſh of the Sea. That was a Priviledge which GOD *declared* or *promiſed* ſhould be *Adam*'s. He therefore that denies the being of a Sea, till long after his death; by contradicting Scripture in a *Natural thing*, muſt reflect diſhonourably upon that GOD, *Who keepeth truth for ever*, *Pſal.* 146. 6. In ſpite of this his Character (which I would not ſhould fail for ten thouſand Worlds) he makes him at once to be falſe to his Word, unfaithful to his Promiſe, and unjuſt to his Creature. But as He that is *righteous in all his Ways*, muſt needs abhor to *be* thus; ſo we muſt abhor to *think* it of him. And farther yet; ſhould GOD evidently violate, but *one* expreſs *Declaration* or *Promiſe* he has made, tho in *Natural things*; what a Damp would it caſt upon mens belief of him in *Celeſtial* Concerns? What a jealouſy might it raiſe, and what a vehement ſuſpicion might it juſtly create in them, as to all his higheſt *promiſſory* engagements; making them

them apt to queſtion whether he would ſtand to any, if not ready to conclude that he would keep none. And thus again the evil, of contradicting Scripture, in *Natural things*, will diſcover it ſelf. He was pleas'd to ſignify, *Gen.* 3. 15. that *the ſeed of the Woman* ſhould bruiſe the Serpents head. Of how high a Nature, and of what infinite Conſequence, was this moſt gracious *Declaration* or *Promiſe*? It was the authentic Patent of Heavens renewed kindneſs to Sinners; and the grand Aſſurance the Prædiluvians had, of its Spiritual and Eternal favours. But if *Adam* and his Children of the firſt world, had found by experience, that the GOD who made it, could break faith with men; why ſhould they regard it? And what convincing experience had they of this, if when he *promis'd* the *Dominion over Sea-fiſh* to them, he did ſo grievouſly tantalize and abuſe them, as to hide both the Sea, and all its Fiſh from them, to the end of that World? Manifeſt it is, that He aſſur'd the Inhabitants of the primitive World, as *much* of *Dominion* over the Sea; as he did of the *benefit* of an incarnate Saviour: but then if he cheated them ſo egregiouſly at preſent, how could they in prudence truſt him for the future; and take his word to be what the *Pſalmiſt* ſtyles it, אמרת צדק *the word of righteouſneſs*, *Pſal.* 119. 123? or as ſome render it (and not improperly) the word of *bounty*, or *kindneſs*. Fraudulent dealing makes Confidence ſhie; and they that have been chous'd, will be cautelous after it. If one ſays he will give me but *two Guineas*, and baſely deceives me; when he tells me he deſigns a thouſand for me, in reaſon I muſt think he puts a trick upon me. So if GOD brake promiſe with the Antediluvians, in a leſſer matter; how could they expect he ſhould perform a greater? His unfair diſappointing them of a temporal bleſſing; would rather have flung them into fatal deſpair

of

of his everlaſting Mercy. His impoſing on them ſo openly once, would have aw'd their faith into ſuch fear and diffidence: that they could no more have reli'd upon his broken fidelity. No more than they could believe, that he made *Adam* and *them*, to be Lords of the Fiſh, and Soveraigns of the Sea; when neither he nor they, ſaw one or the other, to their dying day. And thus for the Credit of *contradicting* Scripture in *Natural things*, we ſee what the tendency of it is, and how excellent the products of it will be. It turns the moſt ſolemn Grants of Heaven, into ſhameful Mockeries; and beſides the diſhonour it brings to GOD, lets in fatal deſpondency upon men. So much for the firſt piece of his apology: the ſecond part of it follows.

Anſw. p. 81. And here in way of farther anſwer to the Charge of contradicting Scripture; he is diſpos'd to *obſerve, how far the Excepter himſelf, in ſuch* (natural) *things, hath contradicted Scripture.* And becauſe the Excepter us'd *dreadful Sentences* towards the Theoriſt, he goes about to ſhow, that he hath *made himſelf obnoxious to them:* And that this might be done the more fairly, we *muſt* (ſays he) *ſtate the caſe truly.* And he does it thus. *Whether to go contrary to the letter of Scripture, in things* *Ib.* *that relate to the Natural World, be deſtroying the Foundations of Religion; affronting Scripture; and blaſpheming the H. GHOST.* Now however he pretends to ſtate this caſe *truly*; it is evident that he does it *falſly.* For it is not going contrary to the *letter* of Scripture, that draws ſuch evil conſequences after it; but going contrary to the letter of Scripture, where it is to be *literally* underſtood. This Circumſtance therefore (which was left out) ſhould have been taken into the Caſe. And this is the great overſight of the Theoriſt; going contrary to Scripture in Natural things, where it is to be *taken* in a *literal* ſenſe. By this means he expoſeth himſelf.

himſelf. But the Excepter is guilty of no ſuch procedure, and therefore the Scriptures alledg'd againſt him, can take no hold of him. In demonſtration of as much, let us but conſider the *firſt* of them, that he cites in his Anſwer, which is, *Pſal.* 19. 5. The whole verſe runs thus, being ſpoken by *David*, of the Sun. *Which is as a Bridegroom coming out of his Chamber, and rejoyceth, as a ſtrong man, to run a race.* So that according to the letter of this Text, the Sun *moves*. But ſays the Anſwerer, *the Sun ſtands ſtill, and the Earth moves, according to* the Excepter's *Doctrine.* Very true. But yet that Doctrine is not contrary to this Scripture, for the reaſon juſt now ſuggeſted; even becauſe its *meaning* is not *literal*. For which reaſon alſo the alledging it is improper and inſignificant. And that its meaning cannot be literal, it proves irrafragably for its ſelf. For take it in *that* ſenſe, and what a numerous throng of ridiculous Abſurdities, will iſſue from it upon the acception? Then the Sun muſt be a man, and muſt be upon his Marriage, and muſt be dreſt in fine clothes, as a Bridegroom is. Then he muſt come out of a Chamber, and muſt give no more light, and caſt no more heat, than a Bridegroom does. Then he muſt have life too, and he muſt have ſenſe; he muſt have paſſions, and he muſt have leggs; elſe how can he rejoyce, and rejoice, as a ſtrong man, to run a race? So that, in ſhort, what is here ſaid of the Sun's *motion*, needs not be *literally* underſtood. It may be ſpoken only *quoad apparentiam* vel ad *captum vulgi*: according to appearance, or common apprehenſion. And the like may be ſaid of the reſt of thoſe Scriptures, which the Anſwer quotes to the ſame purpoſe, either in the Body, or the Margent of it. What therefore was *ſaid* before, we may *think* ſtill; that the alledging this Text was improper and ſuperfluous. And the Anſwerer himſelf confirms this

Ib.

Ib.

thought. For he ſays (*p.* 85.) that *we all leave the literal ſenſe in certain caſes, and therefore that alone is no ſufficient charge againſt any man.* And thus he is ſo kind or complaiſant, as to cenſure and take off his own Objection; and to ſave us the trouble of confuting his Argument, by baffling it himſelf. And which is kinder yet, he tells us (*p.* 84.) *the truth is, if we ſhould follow the Vulgar ſtyle, and literal ſenſe of Scripture, we muſt renounce Philoſophy and natural Experience.* And ſo by a pretty and unuſual ſort of method, the skain which he ruffled, he brings to rights again. Firſt he obſerv'd that we *contradicted* Scripture. Then he ſhow'd *wherein* we did it. Then he *charg'd* us for ſo doing. Then he proclaim'd his Charge *inſufficient*. And laſtly he *allows* the very thing he attaqu'd. For he makes it neceſſary to contradict Scripture in ſome Caſes, and not to follow its literal ſence in all things; Uuleſs we will renounce Philoſophy and Experience. A thing which the Excepter is loth to do. As to the Inſtances he brings, of the Sun's raiſing Mountains, and the Moon's hindring the formation of the Earth: they are ſo far from being Arguments againſt the Excepter, that they are but meer *miſtakes* of his own, as we have here ſhewed. But another Argument he has found out (tho by an odd way of invention) or muſtered up to bring up the Rear, in this Battalion. And by it he intends to make an abſolute conqueſt of us, and to beat us down into humble ſubjection to his own ſentiment: in which he thus triumphs over us, tho before the Victory. *This, I think, is* truly *to contradict Scripture.* Here therefore, I trow, he goes upon good grounds and treads ſure. For ſhould his heels fly up, as they have frequently done, his fall would be the worſe, for running ſo high againſt his adverſary; as he calls the Excepter, in the foregoing Paragraph. And pray, what

Chap. 3*d. and* 10*th.*

Anſw. p. 82.

what is this laſt Argument? Why, *the Excepter, in his new Hypotheſis, makes the Waters of the Deluge, to be but fifteen Cubits higher than the Plain or common ſurface of the Earth, Which Scripture affirms* **expreſsly**, *to have covered the* **tops** *of the higheſt hills.* And again he vouches it; *The Scripture ſays, they covered the* **tops** *of the higheſt Mountains.* But this the Scripture does *not* do. It does *not* affirm *expreſsly*, that the Waters covered the *Tops* of the higheſt Hills. It does *not* ſay, that they covered the *tops* of the higheſt Mountains. And therefore for the Anſwerer to ſay, it *did* affirm and ſay ſo *expreſsly*; This, I think, is *truly* to *force* and *falſify* Scripture. And thus his ill fortune haunts him ſtill; and where he thought to have catcht his adverſary in a Net? he only hampers and intangles himſelf. For he relapſes unhappily, into his old infirmity, and aſſerts what *is not.* For where is it, that *Scripture ſays*, that the waters of the Flood did cover the *tops* of the higheſt Hills? Yet he twice together aſſerts it did; and ſo his recidivation is *double*, and *two* untruths he tells at once. Two Untruths.

'Tis confeſt Scripture ſays, that the Mountains, at the Flood, were *covered* with waters. But ſo it ſays alſo (as we have obſerved) that the Camp of *Iſrael*, in the Wilderneſs, was *covered* with Quails. But as Quails, two Cubits high upon the ground, could not cover the *Tops* of the higheſt Tents; ſo Waters fifteen Cubits high upon the Earth, might not cover the *Tops* of the higheſt Hills. For certain Scripture does not *ſay*, it does not *affirm* **expreſsly** that they did. Yet by this, the Gentleman gives us to underſtand, that what the Scripture *ſays*, and *expreſsly affirms*; is to be believed, and ought to be received. And then why is the being of *a Sea*, before the Flood rejected, and *Adam's* **dominion** over its fiſh denied? I inſtance often in that Sea; becauſe I find it is of the *Subſtance* of the Theory, and a

piece of one of its *Vital Aſſertions*; that the primitive
Ib. Earth was *without a Sea*. *Theſe Obſervations*, ſays the Anſwerer, *I know, are of ſmall uſe unleſs perhaps to the Excepter himſelf.* But without a *perhaps*, the Replicant finds they are of no uſe at all, unleſs to the Obſervator. May he that made them, make the beſt uſe of them.

Here he takes occaſion to reflect upon the *Literal Style* of Scripture. And the laſt Head he ſpeaks to (and the only head that concerns *us*) *is of ſuch things as belong to the* Natural *World. And to this*, he ſays, *may*
Ib. p. 84. *be reduc'd innumerable Inſtances, where we leave the literal ſence, if inconſiſtent with Science, or Experience.* What meant he then, to charge us with going *contrary* to the Letter of Scripture, for ſuppoſing the *fixedneſs* of the Sun, and the *motion* of the Earth? by his own confeſſion before, that charge was incompetent; and by his own Rule here, it muſt be impertinent. By and by he has this Fling, but I know not at whom. *Some men,*
Ib. *out of love to their own eaſe, and in defence of their ignorance, are not only for a Scripture-Divinity, but alſo for a Scripture-Philoſophy.* For my own part, as I hate too *lazy* a Philoſophy, ſo I deſpiſe too *buſy* a one. Sound Philoſophy is a noble thing; and let all advance in it as far as they can: the more expert Philoſophers they are, the wiſer and better they are like to be. But ſtill we muſt remember, that true Philoſophy being bounded by the *Light of Nature*, muſt never interfere with *Revelation*. As on the one ſide, it ſhould not be ſlothful? ſo on the other ſide, it muſt not be pragmatical. Scripture is no enemy to Philoſophy; and Philoſophy by no means muſt affront Scripture. GOD allows men the *freeſt* uſe of their Reaſon; but 'tis unreaſonable they ſhould oppoſe it to Inſpiration; and by uſing it confront his authority who gave them it. So concern'd,

was

was *Plato* to ſhun all ſuch indecency; that being (in his *Timæus*) to debate concerning the Univerſe, εἰ γέγονεν, ἢ ἀγένητός ἐστι, *whether it were made, or not made*; he thought it neceſſary to invoke all the GODS and Goddeſſes, that what ſhould be ſaid, might be κατὰ νῶν ἐκείνοις μὲν μάλιστα, ἕπομένως δὲ ἡμῖν: agreeable to them, and ſpoken conſiſtently. Change but the Object of the petition, and the matter of it will be fit for any Philoſophers Litany. Direct the addreſs to the *One* True GOD, and there can be no fault in its application. And let Notions be ſquar'd by the Rules that it contains, and then Philoſophy may take its liberty. Scripture allows it ſufficient latitude, and the Chriſtian Church will do no leſs. So I am ſure ſhe did of old. For then in her earlier and purer times, ſhe was ſo far from diſcouraging Philoſophy, that ſhe took mens paſſing through its Schools, to be a laudable preparative or qualification for their preferment. Witneſs *Origen* (*cont. Cel. l.* 3.) Οὐκ ἀποστρεψόμεν, &c. *We will not turn away young men from thoſe that teach Philoſophy; but where they have been exercis'd, and have gone the round* with them, *I will try to advance them higher* &c. But if any will abuſe this noble liberty, they muſt anſwer it to him who is *philoſophorum Deus* (as *Tertullian* told *Marcion*) *the GOD* of Philoſophers. And if we would not aggravate our account here, we muſt take heed of one thing: Of entertaining Philoſophy with trifling Notions. For if once we ſuffer it to feed upon ſuch traſh, we may expect it will ſoon get a ſurfeit, and fall ſick of Phantſy; and that's a Diſeaſe which commonly riſes up into paroxyſms of extravagance. And then the vital heat of reaſon, as I may call it, turns into a violent and raging Fever. And ſo the fire that ſhould be kept orderly on the hearth, furiouſly flies up to the houſe top. And the flame which ſhould burn only upon the Altar, conſumes the Temple.

Then

Then he Obſervers; *Upon the whole, you ſee, it is no fault to recede from the literal ſence of Scripture, but the fault is when we leave it without a juſt cauſe. As it is no fault for a man to ſeparate from a Church:* —— *but to do it without a juſt cauſe, is a real fault.* The beginning of this Obſervation does ſtill farther juſtifie us, againſt his late *inſufficient Charge.* And the reſt of it gives us occaſion to enquire, what *juſt cauſe* he had *to recede* from the *literal ſence of Scripture*, as in too many inſtances he has done. For if he left that ſence *without* juſt cauſe, he is αὐτοκατάκριτος, condemn'd by a ſentence out of his own mouth. The Letter of Scripture plainly ſays, that GOD made two *great Lights*: that He gave *Adam* **Dominion** over the *Fiſh of the Sea*: that *Tubal Cain*, was an Inſtructer of every Artificer in *Braſs and Iron*: That the Fountains of the Great Deep were broken up, and the Windows of Heaven open'd, *the ſame day.* Now, pray, what good reaſon, or what *juſt cauſe* is there for his departing from the Literal ſence of Scripture in theſe things? For to recede from it *without* Cauſe, is as *real* a fault, by his own confeſſion; as it is, without cauſe to ſeparate from a Church. And therefore as cauſleſs ſeparation from a Church, is criminous Schiſm; ſo cauſeleſs receſſion from that ſence of Scripture, muſt be culpable deſertion. And ſo if any Writer knowingly and cauſeleſly deſerts the literal ſence of Scripture or diſſents from it; he cannot be innocent. For to uſe the Anſwerers own words, tho *we all leave the literal ſence in certain caſes, and therefore that alone is no ſufficient charge againſt any man*: *Yet he that makes a ſeparation, if I may ſo call it, without good reaſons, he is* **truly obnoxious to cenſure.** And ſo, in ſhort, he becomes his own Judge, and pronounceth a moſt juſt ſentence on himſelf.

Ib. p. 85.

Ib. And thus he comes to the *great reſult of all* which *is this.*

this: To have ſome common Rule to direct us, when every one ought to follow, and when to leave the Literal Sence. And ſuch a Rule, it ſeems, is not wanting. For as he tells us in the next words, That Rule which is generally agreed upon by good Interpreters, is this. *Not to leave the literal ſence, when the ſubject matter will bear it, without abſurdity or incongruity.* But muſt not the knowledge then of this good Rule, aggravate the *breaking* it? Ignorance, which ſometimes excuſes error, does always extenuate it. But if with open eyes we go againſt the light, and ſwerve from the Rule we ſee ſtanding before us; our ſenſes take from us all plea of overſight, and our preſumptuous enormity will admit of little or no apology. But yet the Anſwerer offers ſomewhat to clear *him* in this matter; and it follows immediately in the next words. *This Rule I have always propoſed to my ſelf, and always endeavoured to keep cloſe to it.* May his next *propoſal* then, and *endeavour* of this nature, be more fortunate. And to that end perhaps it may be proper they ſhould be better inforced. For muſt not his propoſal here be too ſlight, and muſt not his endeavour be too faint, when both of them proved ſo inſucceſsful? For had the one been as ſerious, and the other as vigorous as it ought; what could have defeated him, in ſo juſt an Enterpriſe, or diverted him from it? For example; had he really propoſed, and heartily endeavoured to keep cloſe to the letter, where Scripture ſays, GOD made *two great Lights*; or where it ſays, he gave *Adam Dominion* over Sea-fiſh; or the like; what could have hindred him, or beat him off it? As for *abſurditys* or *incongruitys* in the *ſubject Matters* (the only Bar (according to the Rule) which can exclude that ſence) nothing can be more vain than to pretend any here. For as we have plainly ſeen, the readieſt way to open a wide Door, and let *them* in, is to *receede* from the literal ſence.

ſence. 'Tis confeſt indeed, that the literal ſence, in theſe, and other caſes, would have brought in abſurdities and inconveniencies upon the *Theory*, in good plenty. But then this is ſo far from being any reaſon, why the literal ſence of thoſe places ſhould not be received; that it is a moſt clear and convincing Argument, that *that Hypotheſis* is to be rejected. For by the Rule laid down, I ſay, where no kind of abſurdities or incongruitys do accrue to any Texts, from the literal ſence; there it muſt be kept to. And therefore if the Theory cannot ſtand, and maintain it ſelf free from abſurdities and incongruities, without perverting or depraving the literal ſence of the now cited Texts, or any other; and without cauſing a needleſs departure from it: it muſt ſink and fall. And then (as he ſomewhere interrogates the Excepter) *why does he trouble himſelf, or the World, with* ſuch *an Hypotheſis*? Did he do it *meerly out of an itch of Scripturiency*, as he ſpeaks; methinks he might have laid that prurient humour, by ſcratching himſelf with the briars of a more innocent Controverſie; or by ſcrubbing ſoundly againſt ſomething elſe than the holy Scripture. He goes on. *But ſome inconſiderate minds make every departure from the letter, let the Matter or Cauſe be what it will, to be an affront to Scripture. And there, where we have the greateſt liberty, I mean in things that relate to the natural World, they have no more indulgence or moderation, than if it was an intrenchment upon the Articles of Faith.* Let them that are thus inconſiderate in their minds, and immoderate in their ways; anſwer this charge. Prove the Excepter concern'd, and beſides acknowledging his paſt fault, he'll be cautious of recommitting it for the future. But yet the greateſt liberty we have, or may pretend to, in things relating to the natural World; can by no means authorize us to go againſt the letter of Scripture in any caſe, where it

Anſw. p. 67.

Ib. p. 79.

Ib. p. 85.

it is to be *literally* taken, or may be ſo underſtood without abſurdity. If we do, we go directly againſt the Rule of faith, and ſo ſhall ſoon come to intrenchment upon its Articles. He concludes thus. *In this particular I cannot excuſe the preſent Animadverter; yet I muſt needs ſay, he is a very Saint in compariſon of another Animadverter, who hath written upon the ſame ſubject*, &c. *Ib.* In this particular, as the Animadverter needs no excuſe, ſo he asks none. Yet if he uſed the Theoriſt ſo well; *he* again ſhould have uſed *him* the better. But whoever reads over the preſent Anſwer, will eaſily find, that he is treated rather as a grievous ſinner againſt *the holy Theory*; than as a *Saint Excepter*. Who that Animadverter is, of whom he complains, I know not. I have ſeen no other Writings or Animadverſions upon the Subject he ſpeaks of, but the Lord Biſhop of *Hereford's*. And I own that his Lordſhips publiſhing *his Animadverſions*, was good encouragement to me to Print *my Exceptions* at firſt, and to Defend them now. To ſee that therein I ſhould follow the great Example of a Reverend Prelate; and in fighting for the Truth, againſt the Theory of the Earth, ſhould militate under the Epiſcopal Banner.

I was now thinking that I had done, and juſt about to lay down my Pen. But then calling to mind that the Anſwerer quoted a *Review of the Theory* againſt us, as to ſome Texts of Scripture, on which the Theory is bottom'd or does depend: I held my ſelf oblig'd to take notice of this *Review*. And becauſe in it he offers to juſtify his Expoſition, which he formerly made of S. *Peter's* words, and we endeavoured to confute; It will not be improper briefly to except againſt what is there ſaid to that purpoſe. And tho enough has been alledg'd againſt the Theory's ſenſe of thoſe words al-

ready; yet, *ex abundanti*, we'll here caſt in a little more, ſpeaking to S. *Peter*'s words *chiefly*, tho not to them only. And yet we ſhall ſpeak only to *Scriptures*, becauſe in reference to *them* alone, was this *Review* cited againſt us.

Anſw. p. 21. and 61. *Review. p.* 8.

In it he tells us, that *the ſacred Baſis upon which the whole Theory ſtands, is the Doctrine of S.* Peter, *deliver'd in his ſecond Epiſtle and third Chapter, concerning the* Triple Order *and ſucceſſion of the heavens and earth*; and is comprehended in ſeven verſes of that Chapter, which run thus, in the Review.

Ver. 3. *Knowing this firſt, that there ſhall come in the laſt days ſcoffers, walking after their own luſts.* 4. *And ſaying, where is the promiſe of his coming? for ſince the fathers fell aſleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation.* 5. *For this they are willingly ignorant of, that by the Word of GOD, the heavens were of old, and the earth conſiſting of water and by water.* 6. *Whereby the World that then was, being overflowed with water periſhed:* 7. *But the heavens and the earth that are now, by the ſame word, are kept in ſtore, reſerved unto fire againſt the day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men.*——— 10. *The day of the LORD will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens ſhall paſs away with a great noiſe, and the elements ſhall melt with fervent heat; the earth alſo and the works that are therein ſhall be burnt up.* 13. *Nevertheleſs we according to his promiſe, look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteouſneſs.* But that ſuch a triplicity of heavens and earth, as the *Review* contends for, is ſignifi'd or ſet out by S. *Peter*'s words, is very unlikely; and the following *Exceptions* lie againſt it.

Firſt, thoſe words are ſo oppoſite to the *firſt ſtate* of the heavens and earth, that they cannot admit of it, unleſs one paſſage in them be *falſe*: which is this. Ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα which the *Review* renders con-

conſiſting of water and by water. This muſt be appli'd *both* to the Heavens, and to the Earth, as being ſpoken of both. And if it be to be underſtood, not of the *Poſture* of them (according to our Tranſlation) but as the *Review* interprets it; it muſt be void of truth. For firſt, apply it to the heavens, and they muſt conſiſt by *water* as well as *of* water; that is, *by the help of water*, tanquam per cauſam ſuſtmentem, *as by a ſuſtaining cauſe*, ſays the *Review*. But how did water *ſuſtain* the firſt heavens; or *Neptune*, in that State, perform the task of *Atlas*? Secondly, apply it to the earth, and that muſt conſiſt of *water*, as well as *by* water. But how did the *firſt* Earth in order, conſiſt *of* water more than the *ſecond*? Inſtead of that, this *ſecond* Earth is of a far *more watry* conſtitution than the firſt; half the ſurface of the preſent Globe being nothing but Sea. And if it be urged, that ἐξ ὕδατος, *of water*, relates to the Heavens; and δι' ὕδατος, *by water*, relates to the Earth: the very *form* of the words will not allow it. For as the H. GHOST has ſet them, *both* the Expreſſions relate as much to the *Heavens*, as they do to the Earth; and as much to the *Earth*, as they do to the Heavens; and to *both* alike. And the *Review* gives us leave to *refer both to both*, becauſe *it will make no great difference in* its *interpretation*. p. 21. p. 20.

Secondly, S. *Peter*'s words are ſo oppoſite to the *ſecond ſtate* of the Heavens and Earth; that they cannot admit of it, unleſs one Paſſage in them be *inverted*. For the SPIRIT ſays, that *the world that then was, being overflowed with water periſhed*. And ſo plainly makes the watry *inundation*, the *cauſe* of the Worlds *deſtruction*. But grant there were Heavens and Earth of a *ſecond* Order according to the *Review*; and the Earth's *Deſtruction* or Diſſolution muſt be the *cauſe* of that *inundation*. And is it likely that St. *Peter* would ſo teach Philo-

ſophy, that it ſhould not be underſtood without tranſpoſing the terms in which it is delivered, or drawing them to a kind of contrary ſenſe? Who can believe that he allowed this *ſecond ſtate* of heavens and earth, much leſs aſſerted it in diſputing with Philoſophers; when if he did ſo, in his expreſſion (as properly and moſt naturally taken) he miſtook the *Cauſe* for the *Effect*; and made the Earth to *periſh* by its being *drowned*, when indeed it was *drowned* by its *periſhing*, or being diſſolved?

Thirdly, the Apoſtle's words are ſo oppoſite to the *Third* ſtate of Heavens and Earth; that they cannot admit of it, unleſs one Paſſage in them be *contradicted*. For this *Third ſtate*, which is the ſame with the *new Heavens*, and *new Earth*, is by the *Review*, **poſt-pon'd** to the Conflagration. For it tells us that *the Earth, by that fire*, being *reduc'd to a ſecond Chaos*; *from that, as from the firſt, ariſes a new Creation, or new Heavens, and a new Earth.* (*p.* 6.) And therefore the Theoriſt's aſſerting that theſe ſhall riſe *before* the day of Judgment; muſt needs be *plain Contradiction* to what the Apoſtle lays down in the 7th. verſe. For there he ſays, that *the Heavens and the Earth* **that are now**, *are kept in ſtore, reſerved unto fire,* **againſt the day of Judgment,** *and perdition of ungodly men.* And when he has ſaid that οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ, *the* **preſent** *Heavens and the Earth*, ſhall be *kept* and *reſerved* **till the day of Judgment**; the Doctrine of New Heavens and a new Earth to be introduc'd *before* then, muſt be downright *Contradiction* to this. And truly the ſame it muſt be, to affirm that theſe New Heavens and Earth, ſhall be *conſequent* to the general *Conflagration*. Nor is there any way to avoid theſe barefac'd Contradictions; unleſs in complaiſance to this pretty Hypotheſis, there muſt be *two* Conflagrations, and *two* Days of Judgment, and *two* ends of the World; which is one of each ſort more than GOD has revealed.

By

By S. *Peter's* New heavens therefore and his new Earth, we are to underſtand a *new and excellent ſtate of things*, upon which the bleſſed Saints are all to enter, at the conſummation of this preſent World. And as to what the *Review* ſays, *they muſt be* **material** *and* **natural**, *in the ſame ſenſe and ſignification with the* **former** *Heavens and Earth*: this does not appear from the Apoſtle's words. The other ſenſe now mention'd, may rather be inferred from them, conſidering the way or uſage of the holy Writers. For with them it is common, in paſſing from one thing to another, to carry a word or Notion uſed juſt before, along with them farther; or to riſe from a Literal, to an Allegorical, or Anagogical meaning. Such Tranſitions as theſe (to confine our Obſervation to one ſacred Author) occur very frequently in the Goſpel of S. *John*. Thus (in the 4th. Chapter) our SAVIOUR diſcourſing with the *Samaritan* Woman, about drawing *water* out of a *Deep Well*; carries on the matter to Water that he *could give*. To ſuch Water as he that *drinketh of it ſhall never thirſt*; but it *ſhall be in him a* **Well** *ſpringing up into everlaſting life*. But tho the *Well* and the *Water* **firſt** mention'd were *Material*; it does not follow from thence: that the **latter** were the *ſame*, or that they *could* be ſuch. So (Chap. 6.) from ſpeaking of *Loaves*, and of *eating bread*; he raiſes his Diſcourſe, to *that meat which endureth unto everlaſting life*. But yet it is never the more *Material* food; becauſe the *firſt* ſpoken of, was of that nature. And (in the ſame Chapter) the *Jews* telling of *Manna*, or *bread from Heaven*, which their Fathers eat; *JESUS ſaid unto them, I am the bread of life, he that cometh unto me ſhall never hunger*. But this does not make our SAVIOUR, *real Manna*, nor was it poſſible he ſhould be *Material bread*. Yea, being but in the *Jewiſh* Temple, he took occaſion from thence, to call his body by that name (Chap. 2.) *Deſtroy this* **Temple**, *and I will build* p. 10.

it

it again in three days. But was his ſacred Body ever the more a *ſtony building?* And when this was the *way* of our Great REDEEMER, what wonder that his chief Apoſtle ſhould imitate him? And that ſpeaking of the old Heavens and Earth kept in ſtore, and reſerved unto fire: ſhould, in raiſing his Diſcourſe to a future, ſpiritual, bleſſed ſtate; ſpeak of it in the terms, and under the notions, of *new Heavens*, and a *new Earth.*

But *fourthly*, that the Apoſtles words ſhould point at a *triform ſtate* of Heavens and Earth; is very improbable from that *change* which he makes in the *Terms* that he uſes. For in the 5th verſe he uſes the words *Heavens* and *Earth*: and in the 7th verſe again, *Heavens* and *Earth:* but in the verſe betwixt both, he ſays, the *World that then was.* Now if he meant the ſame thing in all three verſes, why did he not uſe the ſame Words? and ſay, *the Heavens and the Earth that were then.* This fairly intimates, that he intended not the *natural*, but *animate* World; and principally *Mankind*, whom he called, *the old World*, in this Chapter; and in the preceding Chapter, *the world of the ungodly.*

Fifthly, that this *threefold ſtate* of Heavens and Earth, ſhould be denoted in theſe words, is not to be thought; becauſe they certify us, that *the World that then was* periſhed. Now could that be true of the *natural* World? Yet it muſt be true of *ſome* World becauſe GOD ſays it: and therefore it muſt relate to a World which *could*, and *did* actually *periſh*; which muſt be the *Animal* World. Indeed by this *Periſhing*, the *Review* underſtands a *change* only in the *conſtitution* and *form* of the Heavens and Earth. But *is*, or *can* that be a *periſhing?* Suppoſe ones temper or conſtitution be changed from *Phlegmatic* to *Choleric*; is the man therefore *periſhed?* Or ſuppoſe the Shell of an Egg ſhould crack and ſink inward a little; is the Egg therefore *periſhed?* No more

could

could the *Material* Heavens and Earth *periſh*, by a meer change of their Conſtitution and form: And had but ſuch a change as *that* befallen them; the Apoſtle would certainly have expreſs'd it accordingly, and not have ſaid, *the World that then was* **periſhed**. But ſince he has thus expreſs'd it, the *animate* World muſt be here underſtood, that ſo the Word ſpoken may come up to the thing, and expreſs it in a juſt and true ſenſe.

But becauſe he ſays, *that the Apoſtle ſpeaks here of the Natural World, particularly in the 6th verſe*: and offers *Reaſons to prove that* it *periſhed* (*Review. p.* 14.) We ſhall lay down the *Subſtance* of theſe Reaſons, and briefly anſwer them.

Firſt, the ground theſe Scoffers went upon, was taken from the *permanency* of the natural World in the *ſame ſtate* from the beginning. And therefore if the Apoſtle would take away their Argument, he muſt ſhow that the *natural* World hath been *changed*, or hath *periſhed*.

Anſw. And does he not ſhow them a ſufficient *change* in *nature* at the Deluge; when (as he minds them) the Earth ſtood ſo deep, and the Heavens ſo high in Water, that thereby the animate world periſhed? Only this change was a change in the *condition*, not of the *Conſtitution* of the natural World.

Secondly, theſe Scoffers could not be ignorant that there was a *Deluge*, which deſtroyed Mankind; and therefore it was the *Conſtitution* of thoſe old Heavens and Earth and the *change* and *deſtruction* of them at the Deluge, that they were ignorant of.

Anſw. If they were not *ignorant* of the deſtructive *Deluge*, they might have *forgotten* it, and therefore the Apoſtle minds them of it. Or elſe they were ignorant or forgetful of the divine *Cauſe* of the Flood; which he therefore expreſsly tells them was the *Word of GOD*. See *Diſc.* p. 137. *Ib.* p. 134, &c.

But

But as to the pretended *change* or *deſtruction* of the Heavens and Earth, I doubt not but *S. Peter* was as ignorant of them, as any of the Perſons he reprehends.

Thirdly, the Apoſtle's *deſign* is to prove the *Conflagration*, which will be a *deſtruction* of the *natural* World: and therefore he muſt uſe an Argument taken from a *precedent deſtruction* of that World.

Anſw. The *Deſign* of the Apoſtle is not to oppoſe *reaſon* to *reaſon* ſtrictly, in a juſt *parity* of *Inſtances*; but fairly to infer *one* judicial and calamitous Providence or Diſpenſation from *another*. And GOD having drowned the *old Heavens*, in *ſome meaſure*, as well as the Earth; by the *word of his power* bringing in the *flood* upon the ungodly: he would from hence convince them, that by the *ſame word*, the *preſent* Heavens and Earth are reſerved unto *fire*; which ſhall then be the inſtrument of perdition to the impious, and the whole living World; as *water* was before. And ſo from *one general deſtruction paſt*, he ſtrenuouſly argues the *certain futurity* of *another to come*.

Fourthly, unleſs we underſtand here the *natural* World, we make the Apoſtle both *redundant* in his Diſcourſe, and alſo very *obſcure* in an eaſy Argument.

Anſw. His Diſcourſe, for this, will *not* be *redundant*, but very cloſe to his purpoſe. For that is not only to mind theſe Scoffers, that men and other Animals were deſtroyed in a Deluge cauſed by GOD's Power; but to repreſent the *greatneſs* of that Deluge, which ſwell'd ſo *mightily* upon the Earth, that in ſome meaſure it *invaded* the Heavens. And therefore to what he ſaid of the flood's deſtroying Mankind, in the foregoing Chapter, v. 5th; he adding here a *deſcription* of the *vaſtneſs* of that Flood, in the drowned poſture which the Heavens and Earth then ſtood in; what he ſays, is far from being *ſuperfluous* or *redundant*.

Nor

Nor is his Argument thus made *obſcure*. On the contrary rather it receives light from hence. For he here bringing in the Heavens and Earth into his account of the *Deluge*; does thereby make the *Greatneſs*, of it, he was repreſenting the more conſpicuous.

Fifthly, the *oppoſition* carries it upon the *Natural* World.

Anſw. The Heavens and Earth that were of *old*, and the Heavens and Earth that are *now*, we grant are *oppoſed*. But then 'tis as to their *Fate*, not in their *Natures*. And tho the Heavens and Earth that are *now*, ſhall *periſh* more *throughly* than they did of *old*; *Fire* being more conſuming than *Water*: yet then for a time they *periſhed* too. That is, in S. *Auſtin's* ſenſe; with whoſe Authority the *Review* makes ſo loud a noiſe to little purpoſe. For ſo far as I can find, neither he, nor any of the Fathers, who affirm the *Aereal* Heavens periſht; do think that they periſht any otherwiſe, than by the Water's *riſing up* into the loweſt *Regions* of the Air. And that place of *Bede* which the *Review* cites, ſeems to ſpeak the *common* ſenſe, as well as his *own*: which gives us to underſtand that the Heavens periſhed, *cunctis aeris hujus turbulenti ſpatiis, aquarum accreſcentium altitudine conſumptis*: *All the ſpaces of this turbulent Air, being taken up by the heighth of the ſwelling waters.* p. 25. According to which, the Heavens periſhed, juſt as the Air does in a Veſſel, when it fills with Water. But let out the Water, and the Air immediately returns into it. So the loweſt Heavens that periſhed at the Flood, by ſtanding in the Water; when that was dried up, preſently recovered their firſt Aereal Conſtitution again.

The *Laſt* reaſon is anſwered in the 4th of the foregoing Exceptions. And from what has been here ſaid, Anſwers may with eaſe be made, to thoſe *Conſiderations* which the Review alledges, in proof of a *Diverſity*

or *Oppoſition* made by S. *Peter*, betwixt the *Ancient* Heavens and Earth, and the *Preſent*.

But farther yet; the Review obſerves, *that S.* Paul
p. 10, 11. *alſo implys that* **triple Creation** *which S.* Peter *expreſſes.* For *Rom.* 8. 20, 21, *he tells us of a* **Creation** *that will be* **redeemed from vanity**: *which are the new Heavens and new Earth to come.* **A Creation in ſubjection to vanity**: *which is the preſent State of the World. And a* **Creation** *that was ſubjected to vanity; in* **hopes of being reſtored**; *which was the firſt Paradiſiacal Creation.*

But by *Creation* or *Creature* here, to underſtand the *Heavens* and *Earth*; muſt be *improper*. For firſt, it is πᾶσα κτίσις *the whole Creation*, or *every Creature*, that is here ſpoken of, *v.* 22d. And where does *that* ſignify the *material Heavens and Earth*, in Scripture?

Secondly, the *Creature* mention'd, is capable of *waiting*, and of *earneſt expectation*, and of *hope*, and of *pain*, and of *groaning*; as the verſe cited, and the context, ſhow. Yea, it ſeems to be capable of *groaning* as we our ſelves do, *v.* 23. Which is above the power of *Matter*, tho never ſo ſubtil or celeſtial.

Thirdly, the *Creature* here, is to be delivered from bondage into glorious liberty, *v.* 21. And this again is a Character which falls not in with the Heavens and Earth. He ſays indeed that *the Creature that will be Redeemed from Vanity, is the* **new Heavens and new Earth to come.** But how will they, (ſuppoſing them come into the *Paradiſiacal* State) be delivered from vanity? For even *then* they can be in no *better* condition, than the *firſt* Paradiſiacal Heavens and Earth were, (as coming but into a ſtate of *Renovation* or *Reſtitution.*) And *they* were ſo far from being *freed* from *Vanity*, that they were ſubject to *corruption*, and *periſhed* at the Deluge, as the Theoriſt holds. And truly ſo muſt the *laſt* Paradiſiacal ones too, unleſs it be prevented.

The

The new Earth, if it ſtands long enough, muſt be *diſſolved* and loſe its *Form*: and the new Heavens muſt be *changed*, at another Deluge, and loſe their *Conſtitution*. Or if the day of Judgment ſhould happen *firſt*, and hinder this; yet where would be their *Redemption* or *Deliverance* here phantſied? For ſtill they would be *vain* and *corruptible* in their Nature; as *Enoch* and *Elias* were both *Mortal*, tho neither died.

To which add, that the Theory (*l.* 4. *p.* 219, 220.) plants *Gog*, and *Magog* in the *New Earth*, and allows them to grow *numerous there, as the ſand by the Sea*. And ſo it can no more be *redeem'd* or *deliver'd* from *Moral* Vanity and Corruption *upon* it; than from *Natural* Vanity and Corruptibility *in* it.

Laſtly, This Creature of the Apoſtles is to be delivered *into the glorious liberty of* **the Children of God**, v. 21. now the liberty of GOD's Children is Moral, Spiritual, and Divine, which is not compleated but in the future exalted ſtate of bliſs: Where, being heirs of GOD, and joint heirs with CHRIST, we ſhall be glorified with him, *v.* 17th. But ſuch a liberty as this, is no way compatible to things meerly Phyſical; and ſo the Heavens and Earth, tho never ſo new and paradiſiacal, muſt not pretend to it, cannot partake of it.

Thus we ſee that the Theoriſts Interpretation of this Place of Scripture, is not right: and therefore of neceſſity we muſt look out for ſome *other Creature*, as here intended. Nor need we ſearch much to find one. *Preach the Goſpel to* **every Creature**, ſaid the H. JESUS to his Apoſtles, S. *Mar.* 16. 15. Here the word is the ſame with S. *Paul's* to the *Romans*. But *Heavens* and *Earth* cannot poſſibly be meant by it, becauſe to *them* there muſt be no Preaching. But by *every Creature*, the *Heathen World* may fitly be underſtood. And ſo this Precept or Commiſſion given to the Apoſtles, is

parallel to that in the laſt chapter of S. *Matthew*; *go, and teach* **all** *Nations*. And then by the *Vanity* to which the Creature was *Subject*, and the *Bondage of Corruption* from which they were to be delivered; we must underſtand, *Idolatry*; to which the Gentiles were miſerably inſlaved. And *that* indeed, in Scripture, is emphatically expreſt, by *Vanity*, and *Corruption*. So the Apoſtles, *Act.* 15th. having preached to *Idolaters*; declare the end of their Doctrine was to turn them from their VANITIES. And *Moſes* in *Deuteronomy*, does uſually point at *Idolatry*, by mens CORRUPTING themſelves. And if we frame the Expoſition of S. *Paul's* words to this ſenſe; it will run very ſmoothly through the whole Paragraph, without any conſiderable check or Difficulty.

See Dr. Hammonds *Annotations on the place.*

Review, p. 11. But after S. *Paul*, he brings in S. *John* alſo, to countenance his Phantſie of this *triple State* of Heavens and Earth. For *he* ſpeaks of *the new Heavens and new Earth.* with *that diſtinguiſhing Character, that the Earth was* **without a Sea.** And *as this diſtinguiſheth it from the preſent Earth, ſo, being a* **Reſtitution** or **Reſtauration**, *it muſt be the ſame with ſome former Earth*, &c. To this we Anſwer. The one and twentieth Chapter of the *Apocalyps*, where we meet with S. *Johns* new Heavens and Earth; conſiſts of two very glorious Scenes. The New Heavens and Earth, make the firſt; and the holy City, or the New *Jeruſalem*, the latter. But this City being *Allegorical*; we have no reaſon to think, that the new Heavens, down *from* which; and the new Earth, down *to* which it came, ſhould be otherwiſe. Alſo this Allegation does no more prove *The Triple State* of Heavens and Earth; or that the primitive Earth was *without a Sea*: than it proves there ſhall be a City built of *pure Gold*, whoſe *twelve Gates* ſhall be *twelve Pearls*, (in a *Literal* ſenſe) according to the tenour of that chapter.

And

And now let us offer but Two ſhort *Exceptions*, which will not fail to ſubvert *the chief Scripture-baſis of the whole Theory of the Earth*, as the *Review* calls it, (*p.* 13th;) by ſhowing that S. *Peter*'s words, as well as S. *Paul*'s, and S. *John*'s, are miſinterpreted and miſapply'd.

The *firſt* is this. In caſe this *Triple ſtate*, or *ſucceſſive Order* of Heavens and Earth, be rightly grounded upon the aforeſaid Apoſtles words; then thoſe *three* moſt eminent Evangelical Writers, muſt implicitly contradict the Doctrine of *Moſes*. And ſo either what he, or what *they* have delivered in *ſome points*, muſt be falſe; and all of them being inſpir'd from above, the H. GHOST muſt contradict Himſelf. By *Moſes*'s Doctrine 'tis very plain, that the firſt Earth had an *open Sea*. For GOD, he ſays, gave man *Dominion* over the *Fiſh* of the Sea; and his Dominion over the *Fiſh*, appears to be as full, and withal as ſoon conferr'd upon him, as *that* he had over the *Beaſts* or *Fowls*. And therefore if theſe Apoſtles, warrant this *threefold State* of Heavens and Earth, in the firſt of which there could be no open Sea; their Doctrine muſt neceſſarily claſh with *Moſes*'s, and implicitly contradict it. So again, by *Moſes*'s Doctrine, 'tis undeniably plain, that there was *Braſs* and *Iron* in the Prædiluvian Earth. For, as he teaches, *Tubal-Cain*, was an Inſtructer of every Artificer in thoſe Metals. And therefore if theſe three famous Apoſtles maintain this triple State of Heavens and Earth; they muſt implicitly interfere with *Moſes* again: becauſe the firſt of theſe ſtates could not poſſibly produce *either* of thoſe Metals; *both* which, according to *Moſes*, were extant in it.

The *ſecond* Exception is this. In caſe ſuch a Triple ſtate as this be truly founded upon the Writings of theſe

three

three famous men; then as all of them muſt contradict *Moſes* implicitly, ſo one of them muſt contradict himſelf expreſly. I mean S. *John*. For ſpeaking of the ſtate of the *new* Heavens and Earth, he ſays, *there was no more Sea*, *Apoc.* 21. 1. Yet deſcribing the final Judgment, which is to be at the *end* of the *ſame ſtate*; he ſays, *the Sea gave up the dead which were in it*, *Apoc.* 20. 13. And ſo in ſhort, there is no more probability, that there ſhould be ſuch a *tripple ſtate* as the Theory has invented, built upon theſe Foundations of the Apoſtles laying: than there is poſſibility that inſpired Writers ſhould contradict themſelves, or one another.

And therefore if what our Author ſays be true; that the *principal parts of this Theory, are ſuch things as are recorded in Scripture*; and ſo *muſt be taken for granted, in one ſenſe or other* (*Review p.* 1:) yet it is ſo far evident, that he has not hit upon the *Right* ſenſe of them, as it is evident the ſenſe that he puts upon them, is not conſonant to Scripture. And *that* is ſo evident, that in his interpreting Scriptures, and applying ſeveral of them to his notions; he ſeems to have verifi'd his own words, where he ſays, *'tis a kind of fatality upon us to be deceived.* Yea, even to be deceiv'd in the paſſages of thoſe principal Apoſtles, of which he thus pronounces. *Theſe three places I alledge, as comprehending and confirming the Theory in its full extent.*

Review, p. 8:

Ib. p. 11.

And that he ſpeeds no better in dealing with *Prophane* Writers about this Matter; than he did in tampering with *Divine* ones: one Inſtance will evince, which we meet with in his *Review* (*p.* 20.) where to ſhow the *true importance of* συνιϛάναι ἐκ *vel* ἐξ, *and how ill it is rendred in the* Engliſh, **ſtanding out of the water.**

water, 2 S. *Pet.* 3. 5: he ſays, that *he that ſhould tranſlate* Plato's τὸν κόσμον συνιστάναι ἐκ πυρὸς, *the World ſtands out of fire; would be thought no* Græcian. And adds, that *Thales's*, ἐξ ὕδατος συνιστάναι πάντα, Cicero *renders*, *ex aqua conſtare omnia.* But this we except againſt as nothing to the purpoſe. For the Authors named, by their συνιστάναι ἐξ, meant that the World was *made out* of a thing as out of its *principle.* But did the Theoriſt's firſt Heavens, συνιστάναι ἐξ ὕδατος, in that ſenſe? was water the *Principle* out of which they were made? So far from that, that *they* were compleatly made, and the *Earth* too, without any water in their Compoſition. Yea, the Sun was fain to dart his fiery Beams through the Earth, to rarify the water in the Abyſs below, and from thence to fetch it up by exhalation; before ſo much as *Vapour* could ſpread through thoſe Heavens. So that they were no more *made out* of water, than the Air is made out of Clouds, becauſe they fly in it; or than a County is made out of a River, becauſe it runs through it. Συνιστάναι ἐξ, in *Plato's* or in *Thales's* ſenſe, has nothing to do here. For beſides that in the primitive Heavens, there was no formal or ſpecific *Water*, ſave only about the Poles of the Earth where it fell; but only *Vapour*: even that Vapour was but *paſſant* through thoſe Heavens, no *Ingredient* of them; no *Principle* of their Being, or *Part* of their Eſſence. But this was that which, the Philoſopher meant, by his, ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος συνιστάναι πάντα: and the Orator confirms it by his reddition of the Words.

We cannot conclude, without making this plain, but true Obſervation. *That the Theory of the Earth is a very vain and falſe Hypotheſis.*

The *Vanity* of it is notorious. For notwithſtanding

ing that it pretends to be *chiefly Philoſophical*; yet all its *Primary Phænomenaes* that we have conſidered; and which make up the biggeſt and moſt Philoſophical part of it; are fain to call in the help of *Miracle* to ſupport them.

Review, p. 2. The *firſt*, is *the Original of the Earth from a Chaos*. But that the Formation of this Earth might in due time be effected, it is ſuppoſed to be done by the hand of *Extraordinary* or *miraculous Providence*.

The *ſecond*, is *the ſtate of Paradiſe, and the Antediluvian World*. And here *Miracle* muſt come in again: for that World could never have been peopled, had not Angels carry'd Mankind over the Torrid Zone.

The *Third*, is *the Univerſal Deluge*. But without *Miracle*, no Rains could have been *before* the fountains of the great Deep were broken up; nor could the falling Ark have been preſerved *after* it.

Nor is the *Falſeneſs* of the Hypotheſis, inferiour to its *Vanity*. For there is never a one of the Phænomenaes aforeſaid, but includes too manifeſt *Contradiction* in it, to the ſacred Oracles, or elſe to it ſelf.

Firſt, *the Formation of the Earth out of the* Theory's *Chaos, contradicts Scripture*. For *that* tells us the Earth was made the *Third day*; but the Theory ſays it was *increaſed* daily. And if to take off this Contradiction to *Scripture*, it be alledged that the Anſwerer allows it might be made in *ſix minutes*; this throws the Contradiction upon the *Theory*. For how could the Earth be made in *ſix minutes*, that was daily *increaſed*?

Secondly,

Secondly, *the Paradisiacal state, and the Antediluvian World* Contradict Scripture. For the *one* gives Paradise a Situation *Contrary* to what *Moses* assigns it; and the *other, against* his most plain Assertions, excludes both *Metals*, and an *open Sea*, with *Adam's Dominion* over its Fish.

Thirdly, *the Universal Deluge* contradicts Scripture. For according to the Theorist, there were *fourscore days* Rain towards making the Flood; but the H. GHOST mentions and allows but *forty*. See *Disc. c.* 8. §. 5. *Answ. p.* 31. *Reply. p.* 67.

This is no more than a Recapitulation, or short Rehearsal of some former Remarks. Yet they fully exhibit the nature of the Theory. And when its *Primary* and Essential *Phænomenaes* are such; what must its *Secondarys* and *Collaterals* be? If the Constituent and substantial parts of an Hypothesis, be so very faulty; impossible it is that the Coincidents or Appendants of it should be justifiable. Yet thus our Author vouches this Hypothesis, in his *Review* (*p.* 12.) It *is not only more agreeable to Reason and Philosophy, than any other yet propos'd to the World; but it is also more agreeable to Scripture.* Having found out words in Scripture, that is, somewhat like to his own; he runs directly away with them, and right or wrong applys them to his purpose. Just as some persons who listning unto Bells, think that they ring what runs in their minds; so if Scripture phrases do but chime as it were, or sound to his sense, our Author concludes that they favour his Notions, tho all be but Phantsy. But let him make good that fair Character, and I am ready to retract what I have said against him, and to turn my Exceptions into applause. In the mean time, I have pursued the Theory as far as I need.

For as for *going through the two laſt Books*, which he ſays *will not be unacceptable to the Theoriſt*, (*Anſw. p.* 66.) I deem it wholly ſuperfluous. Where the Foundations of an houſe are taken away, the Superſtructures can never ſtand. The upper Stories muſt needs follow the fate of the lower ones; and both will certainly fall together.

Γενέσθω ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθὴς, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος Ψεύστης.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAg. 14. l. 24. after *Shores* a full ſtop. l. 25. after *if*, r. *it*. p. 19. l. 11. r. *aereal*. p. 22. in marg. leg. *Luna*. p 32. l. 6. blot out, *in*: p: 58. l. 14: blot out, *only*. p. 65: l. 35. after *Expedient*, r. *and*. p. 72. l. 11. r. *incruſted*: l. 16. r. *account*. p. 87. l. 26. blot out, *Engliſh*. p: 112. l. 31. r. *off*. p. 119. l. 18. r. *aereal*. p. 134. in marg. leg. *delentur*: p. 151: l. ult. r. *his own*. p. 195. l. 28. r. *Tehom*. p. 196. l. 24. r. אר בות p. 205. l. 6: after *head* a full ſtop.

Books lately Printed, and are to be Sold by *J. Southby*, at the *Harrow* in *Cornhill*, 1691.

TWO Treatiſes. The Firſt, concerning Reproaching and Cenſure: The Second, an Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeants* Sure-footing. To which are annexed Three Sermons Preached upon ſeveral Occaſions, and very uſeful for theſe Times. By *William Falkner*, D. D. in 4to.

A Letter to Father *Petre*, concerning his Part in the Late Kings Government. Wherein all his Actions are Juſtified; and wherein alſo the Forgery of a Prince of *Wales* is freely Confeſſed and Juſtified. in 4to

The Benefit of Early Piety, Recommended to all Young Perſons, and particularly to thoſe of the City of *London*. in *Twelves*.

A ſhort View of the Duty of Receiving the Sacrament. Fit to be Read in the Time of Preparation: With Additions of ſeveral Prayers neceſſary to be uſed, before and after *Communion*. in 24.

FINIS.